

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



# Bulletin

Vol. XXXIX, No. 1006

October 6, 1958

**PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND PROGRESS** • *Address by Secretary Dulles* . . . . . 525

**PRESIDENT EXPRESSES VIEWS ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM** • *Exchange of Letters Between President Eisenhower and Members of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations* . . . . . 546

**INTERNATIONAL ORDER UNDER LAW** • *by Attorney General William P. Rogers* . . . . . 536

**PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1958** • *Article by Selma G. Kallis* . . . . . 542

THE  
OFFICIAL  
WEEKLY RECORD  
OF  
UNITED STATES  
FOREIGN POLICY

*For index see inside back cover*

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

# Bulletin

VOL. XXXIX, No. 1006 • PUBLICATION 6709

October 6, 1958

---

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.*

*Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.*

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:  
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25  
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

## Problems of Peace and Progress

*Address by Secretary Dulles<sup>1</sup>*

The United Nations, now in its 13th year, continues to work constructively for peace and order. It has promoted the peaceful adjustment of sharp political differences. It has advanced the independence or self-government of peoples ready for such responsibilities. It has stimulated economic development and human betterment.

But much remains to be done to reinforce peace and to hasten the progress that can then be achieved.

I shall speak first of the problems of peace and then of the opportunities for progress.

### **The Far East**

Let me first turn to the situation in the Taiwan (Formosa) Straits area.

On August 23 the Chinese Communists suddenly launched a heavy bombardment of the Quemoy Islands. The artillery was largely that supplied by the Soviet Union. Hundreds of thousands of shells rained down on those islands during the ensuing weeks, bringing death and destruction, particularly to civilians. This cannonading was accompanied by attempted naval interdiction of the islands and by calls to the defenders of the islands to surrender or be annihilated.

There are, I know, in this situation many complicating factors. But there are two facts that are both undisputed and decisive. These are:

1. The Chinese Communist regime has never during its 9 years of existence exercised any

authority over Taiwan, the Penghus, or the Quemoy or Matsu Islands.

2. The Chinese Communist regime is now attempting to extend its authority to these areas by the use of naked force.

The issue is thus a simple one: armed conquest.

In 1950 the United Nations met that issue squarely. By overwhelming vote it found that the attack of north Korea to "unify" Korea was armed aggression. It condemned the Chinese Communist regime as an aggressor because of its part in that armed attack.

I do not ignore the argument that today's Chinese Communist attack is a "civil war" operation. Mr. Vishinsky made a parallel argument in 1950. He told us that the war in Korea was purely a "civil war" and that outsiders who intervened were "aggressors." The United Nations overwhelmingly rejected that contention.

Also I do not ignore the fact that the offshore islands are physically close to mainland China. But we can scarcely accept the view that nations are entitled to seize territory by force just because it is near at hand.

The fact is that, when one regime attempts by force to take additional territory which has long been under the authority of another government, recognized as such by a respectable part of the world community, that is a use of force which endangers world order.

The United States considers that Chinese Communist armed aggression poses a grave threat, with ominous implications. Surely it demonstrates again that the Chinese Communist regime is not "peace-loving"—to use the language of our charter.

<sup>1</sup> Made before the opening session of the 13th General Assembly at New York, N. Y., on Sept. 18 (press release 543, revised as delivered).

We hope that a peaceful solution can be found. Talks are going on between the United States and Chinese Communist Ambassadors in Warsaw. We seek a prompt cease-fire and equitable conditions which will eliminate provocations and leave for peaceful resolution the different claims and counterclaims that are involved.

The United States reserves the right to bring this matter to the United Nations if it should seem that the bilateral talks between ambassadors are not going to succeed.

#### **Hungary and Germany**

I turn now to Hungary. There tragedy continues. The whole civilized world is shocked by the cruel measures of terror and reprisal. The grim hangings of former Hungarian Premier Nagy and General Maleter were perpetrated in shameful secrecy, violated assurances of safe conduct and no reprisals, and defied the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly.

Such reprisals are symptoms of a more basic crime—the continued brutal suppression of the Hungarian people by a puppet regime imposed by Soviet military power.

The United Nations cannot let itself be discouraged because its past appeals have been ignored. Every government which believes in the principle of self-determination, in fundamental human rights, or in the protection of small nations has a solemn duty to continue to make its position unmistakably clear.

The Soviet Government also defies all efforts to achieve the reunification of Germany in freedom. Members of the United Nations which believe in freedom and self-determination for Asia and Africa should equally support it in Eastern Europe.

#### **The Near East**

I turn now to the Near East.

Just 3 weeks ago the General Assembly took unanimous action designed to ease a serious situation in the Near East.<sup>2</sup> Significant agreement was reached on three crucial points.

First, states should respect the freedom, independence, and integrity of other states and avoid fomenting civil strife;

Second, the United Nations should buttress this pledge of noninterference in the Near East; and

Third, United Nations measures to insure the territorial integrity and independence of these countries would facilitate the early withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

It is significant that it was the Arab nations of the Near East which themselves developed the agreed formula. Thereby they assumed a major responsibility. If, through deeds, the words are given reality, there will be a new opportunity to promote political, economic, and social welfare in the area.

We are somewhat, but not wholly, reassured by the course of events thus far. It has seemed practicable, in agreement with the President and President-elect of Lebanon, to withdraw a second contingent of United States forces. Also, the United States expects to discuss with the new President of Lebanon, soon after he takes office next Tuesday [September 23], a specific schedule for early withdrawal of the remaining American forces.

Our able Secretary-General, who has just visited the area, will shortly make his report, and we hope that it will indicate that the objectives of our resolution are being given practical effect, so that a schedule for early withdrawal of forces can be carried out.

#### **Inflammatory Propaganda**

I turn now to a related proposal made by President Eisenhower at the emergency special session—for monitoring of inflammatory propaganda.<sup>3</sup>

Inflammatory propaganda has been repeatedly condemned by this organization. Nevertheless, it persists. One of the contributory causes to recent tension in the Near East was broadcasts from certain countries, inciting peoples of other countries to violent acts against the established order.

It is our conviction that measures can be taken by the United Nations which will discourage such broadcasts. This would reinforce the solemn commitment of states in the Near East to "respect the systems of government established in the other member States and regard them as exclusive concerns of these States."<sup>4</sup>

One possibility is a United Nations monitoring system for radio broadcasts, from whatever

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Sept. 1, 1958, p. 337.

<sup>4</sup> For text of U.N. resolution, see *ibid.*, Sept. 15, 1958, p. 411.

<sup>3</sup> BULLETIN of Sept. 15, 1958, p. 409.



source, crossing national borders in the Near East. Such a system could have a salutary effect. If propagandists realized their words are being heard in this forum of the world, and being recorded here for future action, they might exercise moderation.

I hope this Assembly will consider this problem.

#### **United Nations Peace Force**

Another matter before this session of the General Assembly is the possible creation of a standby United Nations Peace Force. This was urged by President Eisenhower when he addressed us last month.

The United States suggests the following points for consideration:

1. We conceive of the "Peace Force" not as a combat force, but rather as a group that would observe and patrol, and by its very presence make visible the interest of the world community in the maintenance of tranquillity. Also, we believe that members other than the permanent members of the Security Council can most usefully contribute personnel.

2. A small planning staff might be created within the Secretariat to develop standby plans for calling into being, deploying, and supporting such a Peace Force.

3. The planning staff could develop concrete arrangements so that a United Nations decision to employ such a Peace Force could be promptly implemented.

4. The costs of the standby arrangements envisaged should be kept small, and that should be possible if there is no force-in-being to be maintained.

These arrangements should make it possible to bring together on short notice a United Nations group to meet a need which has become evident over recent years. They would be an important bulwark of the pacific settlement objectives of our charter.

#### **Disarmament**

I turn now to measures which will advance human progress as well as the cause of peace. Most important is arms control to reduce the risk of war and the cost of being ready for it. Today colossal sums which could be devoted to human betterment go into armament.

In past months there has been a significant breakthrough on the arms control front. The United States has long urged that verification techniques were essential to any disarmament by agreement. We believe that governments must have a clear understanding of the practical capabilities of a verification system. The Soviet Union apparently has finally recognized this principle in connection with a possible arrangement to suspend the testing of nuclear weapons.

A technical consensus as to the necessary monitoring system has been reached by qualified experts of different nations.<sup>5</sup> We hope now to begin to negotiate at Geneva a substantive agreement.<sup>6</sup> We do this in expectation that further arms control arrangements will shortly come into effect.

The General Assembly may desire, by appropriate resolution, to give encouragement to the forthcoming negotiations.

The best hope for progress in arms control now seems to rest in taking moderate but concrete steps to reduce the dangers of war.

I recall that, some months ago, the Soviet Union complained in the Security Council of Arctic flights of United States military aircraft. The United States, denying that any such flights had occurred, proposed the establishment of an inspection zone in the polar regions.<sup>7</sup> Such a zone would increase security because it would lessen the possibility of great surprise attack across the top of the world. This beneficial proposal received wide acclaim, and the world was shocked when it was vetoed by the Soviet Union.

In any event we will continue to press for worldwide measures to reduce the dangers of surprise attack. There is now a prospect that technical talks in this field may start in Geneva in November.

#### **Economic Development**

I turn now to economic development.

President Eisenhower at the recent emergency special session made a significant proposal look-

<sup>5</sup> For text of the final report of the conference of experts studying methods of detecting violations of a possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests, made public at Geneva Aug. 30, see *ibid.*, Sept. 22, 1958, p. 453.

<sup>6</sup> For an exchange of notes with the Soviet Union, see *ibid.*, Sept. 29, 1958, p. 503.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, May 12, 1958, p. 760, and May 19, 1958, p. 816.

ing to more rapid economic growth in the Near East. The United States hopes that conditions in that area will lead to the effective fulfillment of that proposal.

Economic development is, of course, an aspiration shared by all peoples. In the newly independent nations, and indeed in many long independent, there is a burning desire for economic and social progress, for higher levels of living, for freedom from the slavery of poverty.

Much has been accomplished already. The American people admire the vigorous efforts of the leaders and the peoples of less developed countries to help themselves. Yet much remains to be done.

The United States believes the time has come for the nations of the world to take stock of accomplishments to date and to chart anew long-term courses of cooperative action. We propose that the nations dedicate the year 1959 to these purposes.

Let me mention some of the major steps that the United States would be prepared to take or support in the coming year, subject to action by Congress as appropriate:

1. The United States will carry forward its existing development financing programs on a vigorous and effective basis.

2. The United States will undertake increased efforts to emphasize the constructive role that private initiative can play in economic development. We hope that other nations will also explore these important potentialities.

3. The United States will consider how we might cooperate with regional development programs, where desired by the countries of the region. The wish for a regional approach should be clearly manifested and supported by the governments of the areas concerned, and there should be evidence that a regional approach has advantage over a bilateral approach.

4. The United States will suggest that consideration be given to the advisability of increasing the capital of the World Bank and the quotas of the International Monetary Fund.

5. The United States is prepared to consider the feasibility of creating an International Development Association, as an affiliate of the World Bank, under conditions likely to assure broad and effective support.

6. The United States is ready to provide vigorous support for technical assistance. It will do so through its own programs, through the Expanded Technical Assistance Program of the United Nations, and through a substantial initial contribution to its new Special Projects Fund. This will greatly enlarge the technical assistance activity of the United Nations.

7. The United States will enlist the assistance of our universities and scientific institutions, joining with those of other cooperating countries, to achieve scientific and technological breakthroughs on problems of particular concern to less developed countries.

8. The President will seek funds from the Congress for health programs.

We hope that other countries may, during the coming year, also chart long-term programs to assist economic growth. In thus paving the way for sound, continuing action by many countries, 1959 could become a year of outstanding initiative in the long-term process of economic growth.

The great challenge of poverty and disease can only be met through vigorous realistic action. The United States stands ready to play its full part in this great peaceful crusade.

The major obstacle to maximum economic development is the ever-present danger of direct or indirect aggression and the consequent staggering cost of armament and of collective security. Whenever there is an outburst of military activity, as now in the Taiwan Straits, that is a setback, not merely to peace but to economic progress.

The United States feels obligated to devote to defense programs some \$45 billion a year, and that will lead us, this year, into a large budgetary deficit. Despite this fact we are determined to move forward in this field of international economic development.

#### **Outer Space**

Major strides in man's conquest of his newest and most exciting frontier, outer space, have taken place in the past year. How shall outer space be used? That is of intense interest and importance to all mankind. We must make every effort to dedicate outer space exclusively to constructive pursuits.

To this end the United States, in January 1957,

proposed that interested countries seek to develop an international system.<sup>8</sup> We recognize that the problems involved in establishing such a system are very complex. We cannot await a comprehensive disarmament agreement. Meaningful steps can now be taken at least to assure that the exploitation of outer space results in maximum benefit to humanity.

Ten precious years were lost in the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy before full international cooperation was begun. We cannot afford a similar delay in this vast new dimension of human experience which offers perhaps an even greater challenge and opportunity than the splitting of the atom.

The United States believes that the United Nations should take immediate steps to prepare for a fruitful program of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. We suggest that a representative committee be established to make the necessary preparatory studies and recommendations.

The United States is submitting to the Assembly a resolution with the following significant operative paragraph:

*The General Assembly:*

1. Establishes an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of \_\_\_\_\_ and requests it to report to the Fourteenth General Assembly on the following:

(a) The activities and resources of the United Nations and its specialized agencies relating to outer space;

(b) the nature of specific projects of international cooperation in outer space which could be undertaken under United Nations auspices;

(c) useful United Nations organizational arrangements to facilitate international cooperation in this field.

The United States hopes that this resolution will find unanimous approval. As we reach beyond this planet, we should move as truly "united nations."

#### **Double Standards**

I have discussed some of the current problems now confronting this Assembly. I should like now to refer to a major concern of the United States which stems from the fact that our membership seems sharply divided in its attitude toward this organization.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1957, p. 225.

Most members look upon the United Nations as a means to promote world order, and they are willing to adapt their national policies to this great goal. But there are a potent few who participate in the United Nations only as it gives them an opportunity for maneuvers which will advance their own narrow nationalistic purposes even at the expense of world order. Otherwise they flout the United Nations.

In the Security Council 85 vetoes have been cast by one of the permanent members. In most of these cases the veto vote was the only negative vote and the vetoed proposal was objected to only because it would have interfered with some ambitious objective of the state in question.

It is difficult to reconcile that conduct with the spirit of our charter.

In the General Assembly there is a similar pattern. Most of the governments represented here give great weight to the recommendations of this Assembly. But there are others which defy those recommendations whenever they interfere with national policies. Hungary is an example.

In consequence of this there is no uniformity in the acceptance and application of our charter and our processes. There are two different standards of conduct.

The United States believes that this double standard is incompatible with the basic purposes of our organization. It poses a challenge which we shall have to meet.

A related concern is the apparent reluctance of some nations to support those basic principles of the charter which outlaw aggression, direct or indirect. Our charter by the first paragraph of the first article calls for "suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace." This represents international law that all should recognize and all should seek to enforce.

After World War I the United States, like others, failed adequately to support world order. But during World War II and ever since, the United States has strongly supported that concept.

President Truman, speaking in April 1951, said "If history has taught us anything, it is that aggression anywhere in the world is a threat to peace everywhere in the world."<sup>9</sup> And President

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Apr. 16, 1951, p. 603.

Eisenhower, speaking last week, called upon us to "defend the principle that armed force shall not be used for aggressive purposes. Upon observance of that principle," he said, "depends a lasting and just peace."<sup>10</sup>

But the teachings of history tend to be forgotten. There is some evidence that we are forgetting them here. We have our charter and our implementing resolutions. These, when adopted, clearly represented the will of the world community, which this organization was prepared vigorously to support. But is that still the case? If not, that would mark the beginning of the end of this organization and its effort to achieve world order and world peace.

The United States as one of the great powers continues to stand ready to dedicate that power to world order. That is an asset which I suggest ought not lightly to be thrown away.

### Conclusion

The future of the United Nations and indeed the prospect for the successful building of a peaceful world depend upon the way in which all of us here in this Assembly discharge the solemn obligations of the charter. We have the two great purposes which I have discussed; namely, the maintenance of a just peace and the development of human betterment in the world.

We need to see more clearly that progress in raising living standards and in extending freedoms around the world is being held back because of aggressions engineered to advance the expansionist urges of certain countries. The treasures and energies of the nations are largely being directed into a tragic and vain search for armed security in a world in which aggression is not yet effectively outlawed. Every aggression is not only a threat to the fragile barrier that stands between us and general nuclear war but also another setback for the aspirations of mankind.

May we not hope that, if the minds and efforts of governments concentrate more fully upon the welfare of their own peoples and creative tasks of universal import, the issues that divide the world may fade away and the cold war become a thing of the past.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, Sept. 29, 1958, p. 481.

## U.S. Rejects Soviet Note on Far East Situation

*Following are the texts of two statements released by the White House at Newport, R. I., on September 20.*

### First Statement

President Eisenhower received this morning [September 20] from the United States Embassy in Moscow text of a lengthy communication from Chairman Khrushchev regarding the Far Eastern situation.

This communication is replete with false accusations; it is couched in language that is abusive and intemperate; it indulges in personalities; it contains inadmissible threats. All of this renders the communication unacceptable under established international practice.

Accordingly, it has been rejected and the United States Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow has been instructed to return the communication to the Soviet Government.

### Second Statement

The letter from Chairman Khrushchev which the President has rejected dealt with the serious situation that has developed in the area of Taiwan (Formosa) since the Chinese Communists, on August 23, began their armed attack. Mr. Khrushchev demanded that the United States fleet and armed forces should at once withdraw from Taiwan (Formosa) and neighboring waters and "go home." He said that unless this were done, the Chinese Communists, with the support of the Soviet Union, would have no choice except "the expulsion" of United States forces.

It is tragic that Soviet military despotism should support the use of force to achieve expansionist ends.

The charter of the United Nations requires that the nations shall settle their disputes by "peaceful means." The United States stands ready to do that and indeed is now seeking a peaceful solution through ambassadorial talks at Warsaw. But it is not easy to negotiate under such threats as the Soviet Union now makes. We deeply deplore the use of such threats.



The United States considers the Soviet viewpoint to be grotesque and dangerous. Indeed only in an "upside down" world could it be argued that it is "aggression" when the United States cooperates with a friendly government purely for defense but that it is "peace" for the Soviet Union to pledge its support to the Chinese Communist regime in its effort to acquire by armed force territory over which it has never exercised authority.

## **United States Seeks Information on Missing Airmen**

### **DEPARTMENT STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 12**

Press release 534 dated September 12

On September 6, 1958 the United States Government in a note to the Soviet Government<sup>1</sup> requested any available information concerning an unarmed United States Air Force C-130 transport plane, carrying a crew of seventeen men, which had disappeared on September 2, 1958, during a flight within Turkey from Adana to Trabzon to Van and back to Adana.

The Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed the American Embassy at Moscow today that the remnants of a destroyed and burned airplane have been found at a point fifty-five kilometers northwest of Yerevan, the capital of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, and that judging by remains discovered there it may be assumed that six of the members of the crew perished.

The Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs further declared that there was no doubt that the airplane belongs to the United States Air Force. It alleged that the aircraft had penetrated for a significant distance into Soviet air space and had fallen within Soviet territory, and had thus intentionally violated the Soviet border. The Ministry protested this alleged border violation and referred to previous Soviet protests regarding alleged similar past incidents.

Chargé d'Affaires of the United States at Moscow Richard H. Davis pressed the Ministry for information about the eleven men unaccounted

for. The Ministry did not provide further information on this point. The Chargé d'Affaires requested that a further search for the missing men be made, that an Embassy officer or other United States official be allowed to visit the site of the crash, and that arrangements be made to transfer to United States authorities the remains of the six crew members.

The investigation conducted by the United States Air Force in Europe (USAFE) has elicited information to the effect that an aircraft identified as a C-130 was intercepted at about 2:00 P. M. on September 2 by fighter planes in the area of the Turkish-Soviet border near Kars. The course of the C-130 was then directed eastward under control of the Soviet aircraft. Following this the sound of an explosion was heard and a column of smoke was seen rising from behind a range of hills within Soviet territory.

Instructions are being sent to the American Embassy at Moscow to press the Soviet Government on an urgent basis to locate and return the eleven members of the crew not accounted for.

### **U.S. NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 13**

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer to the Ministry's note No. 5208A of September 12, 1958,<sup>2</sup> in reply to the Embassy's note No. 252 of September 6, 1958, and to communicate the following on instructions from its Government:

The Soviet note states that the wreckage of a burned and destroyed American Air Force plane has been found 55 kilometers northwest of the city of Yerevan, and that the bodies of six members of the crew have been discovered at the spot. The Ministry was informed in the Embassy's note of September 6 that the crew of the plane totalled 17 persons but no mention is made of the whereabouts or fate of the remaining eleven crewmen. Information as to their whereabouts and condition is urgently requested. If these men have not been located, it is requested that every effort be made to find them. The United States Government expects full cooperation from the Soviet Government in granting access to the crewmen in the custody of the Soviet authorities and in returning them at the earliest possible moment.

The Ministry's note does not identify the bodies found with the wrecked plane. The United States Government requests that representatives of the Embassy accompanied by such technical experts as may be required to investigate the circumstances of the crash be permitted

<sup>1</sup> For text, see BULLETIN of Sept. 29, 1958, p. 505.

<sup>2</sup> Not printed here.

to visit the scene of the crash of this plane, and that facilities be extended to them for effecting identification of the victims of the crash and arranging for the transfer of their remains to appropriate United States authorities.

There is no foundation for the charge contained in the Soviet note that the C-130 aircraft intentionally violated the frontier of the Soviet Union and the United States Government rejects the Soviet Government's protest in this regard. The United States Government does not understand either earlier oral denials of any knowledge of this incident made by an official of the Ministry or the delay in furnishing the United States Government with the limited information contained in the note of September 12, in view of the involvement of Soviet armed forces in this incident. The investigation conducted by the United States Air Force in Europe (USAFE) in connection with the disappearance of this plane has elicited information to the effect that it was intercepted by three Soviet fighter aircraft at about 2:00 p. m. September 2, 1958, in the region of the Turkish-Soviet frontier near Kars, and that following interception the American plane proceeded eastward under control of the Soviet aircraft. Shortly after this an explosion was heard and a large column of smoke was observed rising at a point within Soviet territory.

The United States Government emphasizes that the missing C-130 aircraft was an unarmed transport aircraft clearly marked and operating on an instrument flight plan duly filed in advance in accordance with the regulations of the International Civil Aviation Organization. As the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is aware, it is recognized international custom when intercepting an unarmed aircraft to indicate by signals that the intercepted aircraft shall follow the intercepting aircraft to the nearest appropriate airfield for investigation. As information available to this Government indicates that the C-130 aircraft was intercepted by Soviet Air Force planes, the United States Government expects that complete information as to the circumstances surrounding and following the interception will be made available to it without further delay.

### **Mr. Dillon To Visit 11 Countries**

The Department of State announced on September 18 (press release 544) that Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, was leaving on September 19 on a trip that will take him to 11 countries: Spain, Tunisia, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, India, Lebanon, Switzerland, Germany, and the United Kingdom.

The general purpose of Mr. Dillon's trip is to give him an opportunity to confer with U.S. Ambassadors and other senior U.S. Government

officials regarding operations conducted under the mutual security program, as well as on certain major economic problems, and to meet with senior government officials of those countries which he is visiting for conversations on matters of mutual interest.

### **Japanese and U.S. Officials Conclude Talks**

*Following are joint statements issued to the press following meetings of visiting Japanese officials and U.S. officials.*

#### **JOINT STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 11**

Press release 528 dated September 11

The Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister of Japan met together at the Department of State this afternoon and had a constructive exchange of views in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding. They reviewed the international situation, discussed Japanese-American security arrangements and took up other matters pending between their two countries. Others present at the meeting included Ambassador Asakai, Ambassador MacArthur, Assistant Secretary Robertson, Assistant Secretary (Defense) Sprague and General Lemnitzer.

Security problems facing the two countries were the principal subjects of the discussion today. It was agreed that the Japanese-American Committee on Security, whose establishment was agreed upon in the talks between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Kishi last year, had been successful in strengthening mutual cooperation and understanding in the security field. Foreign Minister Fujiyama pointed out at the same time that seven years have passed since the United States-Japan Security Treaty was signed. He stated that with the re-established position of Japan in the intervening years the situation has now evolved to the point where it would be advantageous to re-examine the present security arrangements with a view to adjusting them on a basis entirely consistent with the new era in relations between the two countries affirmed by Prime Minister Kishi and President Eisenhower in the



Joint Communiqué of June 21, 1957.<sup>1</sup> It was agreed that the two governments will consult further on this matter through diplomatic channels following Mr. Fujiyama's return to Tokyo.

With respect to the Ryukyu Islands, Foreign Minister Fujiyama welcomed the current discussions taking place between the United States authorities and Ryukyuan representatives looking toward a satisfactory resolution of the land problem. Secretary Dulles expressed his understanding of Japanese interest in the Ryukyus and it was agreed that on Ryukyuan matters the two governments would continue to exchange views through diplomatic channels.

The Foreign Minister also touched upon specific issues among which was included the Japanese desire for compensation of former inhabitants of the Bonin Islands who are unable to return to their former homes. The Secretary assured Mr. Fujiyama that the United States is sympathetically aware of the problem and is studying it carefully in the hope of achieving a reasonable solution.

Discussions will be continued tomorrow.

#### **JOINT STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 12**

Press release 533 dated September 12

Foreign Minister Fujiyama met today with Secretary Dulles and Under Secretary Dillon to discuss a wide range of subjects of interest to Japan and the United States. Topics discussed included United States-Japan trade relations, Asian economic development, and the actions and intentions of Communist China, with specific reference to the Taiwan Straits.

In connection with trade between the United States and Japan, the Foreign Minister pointed out the importance of trade with the United States and other industrial nations. He noted that, in relation to trade with the United States, particular attention would be paid to orderly trade and marketing procedures to avoid sudden changes in volume and prices which might have damaging effects. Mr. Dillon expressed appreciation of Japan's efforts in connection with orderly trade and marketing procedures. He referred to

the recent extension of the Trade Agreements Act as evidence of United States interest in pursuing liberal trade policies.

The question of the need for increasing the rate of economic growth in South and Southeast Asia was discussed, and opinions were exchanged with a view to achieving such economic growth in the interest of the free world.

In their discussion of the international situation, the Secretary and the Foreign Minister agreed that international Communism remains the major threat to peace in the world. They also exchanged views on the forthcoming session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and recent developments in the Taiwan Straits. With respect to the latter they agreed that the use of force by Communist China created grave tension in the Far East. They also agreed that the situation in the Taiwan Straits should be settled by peaceful means and without recourse to force.

The Secretary and the Foreign Minister agreed that their talks during the past two days have been most helpful both in achieving closer understanding and in enabling a higher degree of coordination in fields of mutual interest.

Today's meetings concluded the Washington talks.

#### **United States and Turkey Hold Economic Discussions**

##### **DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

Press release 521 dated September 9

The Minister of Finance of Turkey, Hasan Polatkan, arrives at Washington on September 10 to discuss implementation of the recently agreed upon financial assistance program to Turkey with officials of the U.S. Government. During his 3-day visit Mr. Polatkan will meet with the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury, and senior officials of the Export-Import Bank and the International Cooperation Administration. It is expected that he will also confer with the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

<sup>1</sup> For text, see BULLETIN of July 8, 1957, p. 51.

He will be accompanied by Hasan Isik, Secretary General of the Turkish International Cooperation Organization, Memduh Aytur, Director General of the Turkish Treasury, Ziya Muezzinoglu, Counselor of the Turkish Treasury, Munir Mostar, Inspector General of the Ministry of Finance, and Fikri Diker, Assistant Director General of the Central Bank of Turkey.

#### JOINT STATEMENT

Press release 535 dated September 13

A Turkish Mission headed by His Excellency, Hasan Polatkan, the Turkish Minister of Finance and Acting Minister of Industry, has been in Washington the past three days as the guest of Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs C. Douglas Dillon.

In addition to talks with Secretary Anderson and Under Secretary Dillon, Minister Polatkan met with Mr. James H. Smith, Jr., Director, International Cooperation Administration; Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, and Mr. Dempster McIntosh, Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund. The Minister also took advantage of his presence in Washington to visit with Mr. Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund and Mr. Eugene Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

During his visit the Minister called upon the Secretary of State.

In his talks with United States officials, Minister Polatkan reviewed the progress to date of the economic stabilization program which the Turkish Government introduced on August 3, 1958 and made clear the firm determination of the Turkish Government to carry out this program vigorously. Officials of the United States Government were greatly encouraged by the measures the Turkish Government has taken and by its determination to carry through the new program to a successful conclusion. Given this determination it was the view of United States officials that the stabilization program of the Turkish Government promises to assure adequate supplies of goods to the Turkish economy and to bring about stability and economic strength in the future.

During the course of the talks, Minister Polat-

kan discussed with United States officials the question of implementing the aid agreements with the United States which were announced on August 3,<sup>1</sup> and which involved \$234 million of various forms of assistance. As a result of these talks arrangements were made that \$75 million would be made available immediately to finance imports during the remainder of 1958. In addition it was agreed that 225 million Turkish lira, equivalent to 25 million dollars, which has been generated from previous sales of surplus agricultural commodities (P.L. 480) would be granted to the Turkish Government in order to provide immediate local currency financing.

In further implementation of the program of financial assistance to Turkey, the Export-Import Bank signed on September 12 an agreement with Turkey establishing a line of credit in the amount of \$37.5 million to assist in financing projects in the private as well as public sectors of the Turkish economy. The line of credit will be available up to December 31, 1959 and the principal amount, rate of interest, repayment period and related conditions for each project will be subject to separate agreement between Turkey and the Export-Import Bank.

Discussions with the Development Loan Fund concerned the selection of development projects totaling \$37.5 million to be financed by the institution under the August 4 agreement. Progress was made toward reaching agreement on projects in the fields of mining, agriculture, power and industry and final decisions are expected in the near future. At the conclusion of the Development Loan Fund discussions with Minister Polatkan, Ambassador McIntosh signed an agreement finalizing a \$10 million DLF loan to the Industrial Development Bank of Turkey which had been announced by the DLF in May of this year. This loan is in addition to the \$37.5 million of project loans now under discussion between the Turkish Government and the DLF.

The United States officials expressed the active and continuing interest of the United States in the economic development of Turkey.

Minister Polatkan was accompanied by Hasan Isik, Assistant Secretary General for Economic Affairs of the Foreign Ministry; Memduh Aytur, Director General of the Treasury; Ziya Muezzinoglu, Counselor to the Treasury; Fikri Diker,

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Aug. 25, 1958, p. 322.

Assistant Director General of the Central Bank and Munir Mostar, Financial Inspector, Ministry of Finance.

## **Indian Finance Minister Visits United States**

Press release 526 dated September 9

The Department of State announced on September 9 that Morarji R. Desai, Finance Minister of the Government of India, during his 3-day visit to Washington, met and had discussions with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Acting Secretary of Commerce, and Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Samuel C. Waugh, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, J. H. Smith, Jr., Director, International Cooperation Administration, and Tom B. Coughran, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Discussion covered a wide range of topics, principally in the economic and financial field with particular reference to India's foreign-exchange needs for economic development.

Mr. Desai was informed that, in connection with recent discussions held under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on the Indian financial problem, the United States is prepared in the U.S. fiscal year ending June 1959 to finance through the Development Loan Fund a series of economic development projects in India which are expected to total about \$100 million. Loans for these projects would be long-term and repayable in Indian rupees. In addition the Finance Minister was informed that the United States is prepared to begin discussions leading to the conclusion of an agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (P.L. 480) which would provide for the sale for local currency of surplus agricultural commodities. Such an agreement would provide food grains having an export value of about \$200 million. Finally Mr. Desai was informed that the United States has authorized its Embassy in New

Delhi to exchange notes with the Indian Government to amend the present repayment schedule of the \$190 million wheat loan extended to India in 1951 to defer the interest and amortization payments which are due over the next 9 years.

Mr. Desai was accompanied in his meetings with U.S. Government representatives by H. Dayal, Indian Chargé d'Affaires ad interim, and B. K. Nehru, Commissioner General for Economic Affairs.

## **International Aviation Authorities To Hold Symposium in U.S.**

The Department of State announced on September 16 (press release 539) that an international symposium on "The United States Domestic Short Distance Navigation System—VORTAC—and Its Relationship to the International Air Navigation System" will be held at Washington October 1-2, 1958, and at Indianapolis October 3-4, 1958. Invitations have been issued to aviation authorities of foreign governments and to other international aviation organizations.

This international meeting is designed to better acquaint the responsible aviation authorities of governments and other aviation interests with the bearing and distance concept of the U.S. air-navigation and traffic-control system. The International Civil Aviation Organization has scheduled a special meeting for February 1959 on the subject of short-distance aids and their relationship to other elements of the air-navigation system. The symposium is being held to assist nations and their aviation interests in preparation for the ICAO meeting.

Present plans call for the symposium to last from October 1 to 4, with 2 days of presentation and discussion of papers at Washington and 2 days of demonstrations of equipment at the CAA Technical Development Center at Indianapolis. An operational flight demonstration will take place during the flight from Washington to Indianapolis.

## International Order Under Law

*by William P. Rogers*

*Attorney General of the United States<sup>1</sup>*

It is an honor and a privilege to address the 48th biennial conference of the International Law Association. As a representative of the Government of the United States it is with warm pleasure that I welcome you to our country and express the hope that you will have a most successful conference.

Since the association was founded, it has been the innovator, architect, and craftsman of many important contributions within the field of international law. These contributions have been the product of painstaking research, informed judgment, and effective advocacy.

You have long recognized the necessity for the supremacy of law and have defended it against overwhelming and recurrent tides of recalcitrance and inertia. It is my belief that those tides are ebbing. I believe that we are at the threshold of new and far-reaching developments in the fields of both public and private international law.

The same forces that within a decade have induced science to develop the atom and have brought man to the verge of outer space are exerting a relentless pressure on mankind to bring it to its senses to prevent its self-destruction. As President Eisenhower said, the world situation today makes it imperative to depose the rule of force and to enthrone the rule of law in international differences.

Our primary concern, therefore, is the attainment of peace and international order under law. There are many hopeful signs of progress.

In this country there is a substantial step-up in activities by such organizations as bar associa-

tions, foundations, and universities in working toward greater reliance on international rules of law. Cornell, Harvard, and Southern Methodist University are among the institutions that have actively been working on important phases of the problems. The most recent development in this field is the announcement that a Rule of Law Center is being established under the auspices of Duke University Law School with Mr. Arthur Larson, a former Special Assistant to the President, as director.

There are a number of worthwhile steps to be taken within the not-too-distant future. As you know, much study will be given to the possibility of international agreements applying impartial judicial machinery to the question of compensation for nationalization of foreign investments. Success in this direction could have dramatic effects in facilitating vast new surges of private investment in newly developing countries.

Another worthwhile possibility is the gradual development of effective regional international courts, perhaps for a specific function, as in the case of the judicial machinery of the European Common Market.

Moreover, there is much work to be done in bringing together in usable and convenient form the existing international law precedents that are now scattered in many places. As you know, the International Law Commission is presently engaged in codifying such law. If we are to live by an international rule of law, one of the indispensable steps is to clarify the law and make it accessible, understandable, and usable. Here again the lawyers and scholars and universities of every country must help if the job is to be done.

<sup>1</sup> Address made before the 48th biennial conference of the International Law Association at New York, N. Y., on Sept. 2.



### **Making the Rule of Law an International Reality**

A part of the overall task of making the rule of law an international reality lies in the creation of a worldwide state of opinion which more and more accepts law as normal in international settlements. Designations such as "Law Day, U.S.A.," which this year concentrated on stressing the international-rule-of-law theme, may be expanded upon and improved. There are many other ways of working toward greater public acceptance of the rule of law in international affairs, including the use of conferences, radio and television shows, and thoughtful and forceful presentations through the press and in other publications. One of the planning committee for this conference, Henry Luce, has assumed a major role in gaining this acceptance, not only through the *Time* and *Life* publications but in a quiet and effective personal way.

The United States Government has recently taken an important step in furtherance of international order under law. It touches primarily the field of private international law. As you may know, Congress last month enacted legislation establishing a Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure. The statutory function of the commission is to investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view to achieving improvements.

The scope of the commission's work will be broad. It will investigate procedures for international judicial assistance incident to litigation, including such matters as the service of judicial documents, the obtaining of evidence, and the proof of foreign law. Its objective will be to evolve, on a reciprocal basis, procedures which are "more readily ascertainable, efficient, economical, and expeditious." To that end, the commission is directed to draft and recommend to the Government appropriate international agreements and draft legislation.

### **Principles of Law Applicable to Outer Space**

Another matter of increasing public concern involves the principles of law applicable to the exploration and development of outer space. Today, less than 50 years after its meetings in Europe in 1911 and 1912, your association and others have an opportunity to aid in the formu-

lation and development of a system of international law to meet this challenge.

The immediate problems concern matters relating to flight instrumentalities in space. Ultimately the questions may require a consideration of such complex and challenging legal problems as those relating to the development and utilization of the natural resources of celestial bodies not yet within the reach of any nation or group of nations.

Some of these questions may be: What is the legal status of those areas of space used in the passage of a satellite? Can existing jurisprudence be adapted to the problems that astronautics poses? How may one ascertain the legal status of a satellite for purposes of protection or control, regulation of flight paths and orbits? Can the existing principles of international air law be applied to each zone as man is able to reach it? Or is it advisable to lay aside for the time being the entire problem of national sovereignty in outer space?

### **Jurisdiction of International Court of Justice**

One area which holds promise for progress relates to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

You will recall that, prior to adoption of the U.N. Charter, international law did not compel any state to submit its disputes for determination to the International Court against its will. The same policy was followed when the U.N. Charter was adopted. Article 2 (7) of the charter excludes intervention by the United Nations in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

In the statute which creates the Court and which defines its authority, it is optional for states to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. When the United States filed its declaration of acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction, it attached certain conditions to its acceptance.

Among specific limitations the declaration of the United States stated that the jurisdiction of the Court shall not apply to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. No one could question this limitation, for it safeguards the national independence of a country and its internal affairs. It was also consistent with the charter of the U.N. Further-

more, it was implicit in the nature of international law itself, which the Court under its statute was bound to apply, for, by definition, international law governs the body of rights and duties in the relations of states with each other and thereby excludes itself from domestic-jurisdiction matters.

There was, however, an additional specific limitation attached by the United States which created concern among many of our statesmen and many international lawyers of repute. This limitation reserved the right of the United States, rather than the Court, to determine whether a matter fell within this country's domestic jurisdiction.

The events leading to this decision are of interest, for the decision, in my judgment, needs reexamination.

#### **Senate Debate on International Court**

The matter of domestic-jurisdiction reservations came up during 1946 upon consideration of the Senate resolution to accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice established under the U.N. Charter. This resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Senate for favorable action. Its report recommended a reservation of "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." In urging the Senate to adopt the resolution, the committee expressed the hope of placing international relations on a legal basis. It recognized that a regime of law in the international community could never be fully realized so long as any individual members could refuse to be bound by the jurisdiction of the Court. To achieve this aim it felt that the Court must have jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter.

The Senate committee rejected any suggestion that the United States should reserve to itself the right to decide what disputes were domestic. It was its view that such a provision would be self-defeating. If this matter were left to the decision of each individual state, it would be possible to withhold any case from adjudication on the plea that it was a matter of domestic jurisdiction.

It was only after Senate Resolution 196 reached the floor of the Senate that objections arose regarding the reservation of domestic jurisdiction. The question was raised in debate as to who would determine whether a matter was of a domestic character not subject to the jurisdiction of the International Court. Apprehension was expressed

that, unless it was the United States rather than the Court which made this determination, the International Court could readily extend its jurisdiction to various domestic issues, particularly immigration and trade barriers.

There were several answers to this contention in the debate. One was that it is the function of the Court under the compulsory-jurisdiction clause to decide cases in accordance with established rules of international law. Since there is no international law dealing with the subject of immigration and since this has been traditionally a matter for domestic determination, it was argued that the International Court could not take jurisdiction over this kind of case. As far as tariffs are concerned, it was shown that, unless the United States enters into an international treaty subscribing to certain rights and duties, there is no international law on the subject which the Court may apply. Thus it was argued that the anxiety expressed respecting possible extension of the Court's jurisdiction to such traditionally domestic matters as immigration and trade restrictions was wholly unfounded.

Despite these arguments, the fears of those who opposed the committee's report were accepted and the report was overridden. The Senate voted to reserve to the United States the right to decide whether a matter was within its domestic jurisdiction.

When a country, rather than a court, has the power to decide whether a matter relates to its domestic jurisdiction, it may be difficult because of the political realities of life for even the most cooperative government to concede jurisdiction. The result is that controversies over which the court has jurisdiction can readily be converted into controversies not within its jurisdiction by mere decision of the party nation rather than by decree of the court.

In addition, a reservation which enables one country to decide whether domestic jurisdiction is involved is an invitation for other countries to assert a like limitation. Thus, similar reservations permitting the declaring state to determine what is domestic have been filed by several countries.

With this history of the domestic-jurisdiction reservation before us, the question is whether this type of specific reservation by several nations as to the jurisdiction of the Court tends to impair or enhance a rule of law in international affairs.



Should such reservations be retained in their present form? Just as domestic courts could not function effectively if parties chose not to appear, so, too, the administration of justice by international courts is impaired and may be nullified if the nations can refuse to submit their differences to it.

It is important, too, to bear in mind that the mere fact that a court is open for dealing with disputes and that the parties may be compelled to appear before it is often enough to spur parties into settling their differences amicably out of court. This might well be the case in some international disputes as well as in cases of a private nature.

#### **Effect of Domestic-Jurisdiction Reservation**

In over 10 years of the Court's operation, we have seen that the effect of one country's domestic-jurisdiction reservation, unilaterally determined, has spawned many others. Thus the area of international adjudication has been tragically limited. We have seen the "boomerang" effect of this type of reservation when even a nation not having such a reservation employed it on the basis of reciprocity.

The record of the International Court makes it clear that this Court of distinguished jurists has not engaged or attempted to engage in usurpation of jurisdiction which does not belong to it. Nor is there any reason to believe that it ever would. As we are aware, relatively few cases have been before the Court.

Our courts in the United States, because of the great increase in the volume of work, are congested with cases. One could fairly say, conversely, that the International Court is isolated from cases.

The time has come, I think, in the light of experience with the Court to reexamine the domestic-jurisdiction reservation of the unilateral type to determine if it should be retained or changed. If retained, it might be limited in some more reasonable way.

The International Court needs more support if it is to succeed in the accomplishment of its purposes. Without some step looking toward some enlarged jurisdiction it cannot hope to attain the position it should occupy in the world community striving toward a rule of law and justice.

Once nations begin to submit some of their international disputes to impartial international

adjudication—and I mean as an established procedure and not as the voluntary exception—we will have taken another important step toward justice under an international rule of law.

We must, I believe, make more progress, even if limited progress, toward the proposition put forward by Woodrow Wilson in 1918: "What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

## **U.S. and Czechoslovakia Exchange Views on Summit Conference**

### **U.S. NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 12<sup>1</sup>**

The United States Government refers to the memorandum of the Czechoslovak Government of May 31 stating that Government's views with regard to the holding of a Summit conference and participation of Czechoslovakia in it.

The considerations set forth in the Czechoslovak memorandum present an erroneous picture of the attitude of the United States Government. The United States does not underestimate the significance of a Summit meeting nor is it attempting to delay its convocation. However, the United States attaches more importance to the achievement of genuine agreements than to the forum in which those agreements are reached.

The unanimity reached at the Third Emergency Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly<sup>2</sup> and the successful outcome of the technical talks at Geneva<sup>3</sup> demonstrate that useful agreements can be attained in various appropriate ways. With regard to a Summit conference, the United States continues to hold that it would be desirable if it would provide opportunity for serious discussion of major problems and if it would be an effective means for reaching agreement on significant subjects.

<sup>1</sup> Delivered to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia by the American Embassy at Prague on Sept. 12 (press release 537 dated Sept. 15).

<sup>2</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 15, 1958, p. 409.

<sup>3</sup> For background and the text of the technical experts' final report, see *ibid.*, Sept. 22, 1958, p. 452.

A concrete effort to prepare for such a conference was made on March 31 by the three Western powers when they invited the Soviet Government to initiate diplomatic talks in Moscow for this purpose.<sup>4</sup> The preparatory discussions met with difficulties arising from the fact that the proposals as to what problems should be examined by the Heads of Government put forward by both sides were too diverse to be acceptable to either. The Western powers attempted to resolve these difficulties by proposing on May 31<sup>5</sup> that all specific proposals be reviewed in diplomatic talks in Moscow under general categories in order to determine which should be submitted for examination by Heads of Government. On July 1<sup>6</sup> and again on August 22,<sup>7</sup> the United States, together with France and the United Kingdom, expressed regret that the preparatory discussions in Moscow were at a standstill and called upon the Soviet Government to consider the practical procedure for discussing a Summit conference agenda which they had suggested on May 31. It is the Soviet Union that has blocked any progress on this matter by its failure to accept this proposal or to submit an equally effective and workable alternative. There is no basis for the Czechoslovak assertion that the United States is endeavoring to delay the convocation of a Summit meeting.

In discussing the Western proposal concerning Eastern Europe, the Czechoslovak memorandum seeks to create the impression that the Western powers wish to interfere in the internal affairs of the Eastern European countries. It has been the traditional policy of the United States Government to support the right of all countries to freedom and independence and the right of their peoples to choose their own form of government. The United States Government therefore seeks to develop adequate guarantees against any interference in the internal affairs of all countries and against the use of force in the settlement of disputes which may arise. In accord with this policy the United States Government agrees that the

political and economic systems of the Eastern European countries are the exclusive concern of their peoples.

The United States Government believes that it would be premature to consider the composition of a Summit conference until the agenda for such a conference has been agreed upon. If, after agreement is reached on an agenda, it appears that Czechoslovakia's participation would serve a useful and constructive purpose, the United States Government would welcome such participation. The Czechoslovak Government will understand, of course, that although many countries would likely believe that their interests would be involved in any discussions carried out at a Summit conference, such a conference to be effective would have to be limited in size.

The Government of the United States agrees that the object in determining the composition of a Summit conference should be to promote to the utmost the achievement of positive results, and welcomes the Czechoslovak Government's assurance that it is ready to create favorable conditions for the success of a Summit conference.

#### CZECHOSLOVAK MEMORANDUM OF MAY 31

Unofficial translation

Bearing in mind the interests of strengthening world peace and security, The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic has more than once expressed its conviction as to the urgency of an early convocation of a summit Conference which would provide a forum for discussing the most important and most pressing international issues, the solution of which would contribute to the relaxation of tension in the world, to the restoration of confidence and to the promotion of peaceful coexistence among states.

The idea of convening a Conference of the Heads of Governments is already deeply rooted in world public opinion. The nations are justified in expecting that it will take place as early as possible. Under the pressure of world public opinion even the Western Powers have expressed their concurrence in principle with the holding of the Conference.

On the other hand, however, there have recently been intensified attempts at belittling the significance of the Conference and at delaying its convocation. As a result of the assumption that the concern of the world public opinion has already been sufficiently lulled, the adversaries of the Conference seek to cast in doubt its purpose and opportuneness. In this connexion it is not possible to disregard the position taken in respect of the Confer-

<sup>4</sup> For text of a three-power declaration presented to the Soviet Government on Mar. 31, 1958, see *ibid.*, Apr. 21, 1958, p. 648.

<sup>5</sup> For background, see *ibid.*, July 7, 1958, p. 12.

<sup>6</sup> For text of a letter from the President to Premier Khrushchev released by the White House on July 2, 1958, see *ibid.*, July 21, 1958, p. 95.

<sup>7</sup> For text of U. S. note, see *ibid.*, Sept. 22, 1958, p. 462.

ence of the Heads of Governments by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council at its recent session in Copenhagen. In the closing communique of the session<sup>4</sup> doubt is expressed whether at the present time the summit Conference is the best means for the lessening of international tension. However, the development of events in recent years has shown quite clearly that after the consideration of these important questions of international policy in other world forums failed to produce the expected results, a summit Conference, attended by the Heads of Governments, appears to be the most effective means for a discussion which would undoubtedly be instrumental in the relaxation of international tension.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic are of the opinion that the summit Conference should discuss the problems contained in the proposals submitted by the Government of the U.S.S.R., which received full support in the Declaration of the Member States of the Warsaw Treaty of May 24, 1958, including such serious and pressing problems, for the settlement of which there exist today genuine prerequisites, as the cessation of nuclear tests, the pledge of the Great Powers to renounce the use of nuclear weapons, and the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the States Members of the North Atlantic Treaty and the States Members of the Warsaw Treaty. The broad masses of world public opinion have accepted and greatly appreciate the proposal submitted by the Polish People's Republic for the establishment of an atom-free zone in Central Europe as an important contribution to the lessening of international tension and the elimination of the threat of an atomic war in Europe. The more regrettable is, therefore, the position held by certain Western Powers which are rejecting this proposal. The reasons given for this rejection cannot weaken the conviction of the broadest masses of the population of the European as well as non-European countries that the proposal is beneficial to the cause of peace and security.

None of these problems is being submitted for discussion in the interest of one side alone. It is life itself that has placed them before the nations of the world, and their consideration and settlement would not harm the interests of any country, but, to the contrary, would help to improve the international situation, strengthen security in Europe and eliminate mutual distrust.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic, as well as the other States Members of the Warsaw Treaty, categorically reject the consideration of the provocative and construed question of the so-called situation in the countries of Eastern Europe, for the inclusion of which in the agenda of the summit Conference the ruling circles of some NATO States are pressing. Similar proposals constitute inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, incompatible with international law and the United Nations Charter.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, May 26, 1958, p. 850.

Nor can the question of the unification of Germany, which the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council at its last session sought to force onto the agenda of the Conference, constitute an item suitable for consideration by the Conference. This question can only be resolved by the German people themselves, represented by the two German States—the German Democratic Republic and the German Federal Republic.

Neither the raising of such conditions as the discussion at the Conference of the question of disarmament on the basis of the proposals submitted by the Western Powers on August 29, 1957<sup>5</sup> can, in the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government, in any way be regarded as a constructive approach to expediting its convocation. These proposals have already been rejected as impracticable and unacceptable.

The requirement of a speedy convocation of the Conference at the summit is fully met by the last Memorandum of the Government of the Soviet Union of May 5<sup>10</sup> of this year, which fully opens the prospects for an expeditious termination of the preparatory work resulting in agreement and followed by an early convocation of the Conference of the Heads of Governments.

The questions to be considered are of such gravity that they impose the categorical demand to refrain from further delays, to bring the negotiations through diplomatic channels to a speedy conclusion and to proceed to the conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs followed by that of the Heads of Governments.

Regarding the composition of the parties to the talks, it is necessary to proceed from the real situation in such a manner as to promote to the utmost the achievement of positive results. This requirement is fully met by that part of the Declaration where the States Members of the Warsaw Treaty have expressed their consent with a limited participation at the summit Conference of three /four/ Countries Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and three Countries Members of the Warsaw Treaty and have authorized the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Republic /the People's Republic of Roumania/ to attend the Conference on behalf of the countries which are signatories of the Warsaw Treaty.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic wishes to seize this opportunity to stress once again its previously expressed readiness to contribute by all means at its command to a speedy convocation of the summit Conference and to the creation of the most favourable prerequisites for its successful result.

The Czechoslovak Government expects that also the Governments which today have major responsibility for the convocation of the Conference at the summit will on their part not fail to do everything in order to fulfill the hopes that the nations have placed in the summit Conference.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Sept. 16, 1957, p. 451.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, July 7, 1958, p. 17.

## Principal Provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958

by Selma G. Kallis

For the 11th time since the enactment of the original Trade Agreements Act in 1934, action was taken during the 85th session of Congress to extend the President's authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries for the reciprocal reduction of tariffs and other import restrictions. On August 20, 1958, the President signed into law the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, Public Law 85-686. Following is a summary of the principal provisions of the act.

### Extension of Period

The 1958 act extends for 4 years, i. e., from the close of June 30, 1958, through June 30, 1962, the period during which the President is authorized to enter into trade agreements. This is the longest period for which authority has been granted in the history of the trade agreements program. Previous periods have ranged from 1 to 3 years.

### Authority To Decrease Rates of Duty

In trade agreements entered into during this 4-year period the President is authorized to reduce U.S. duties in stages by any one of three alternative methods as follows:

1. Reducing the rate existing on July 1, 1958, by not more than 20 percent, provided that no more than a 10 percent reduction can be made effective in any one year.<sup>1</sup>

• *Mrs. Kallis, author of the above article, is Acting Special Assistant in the Trade Agreements Division.*

2. Reducing the rate existing on July 1, 1958, by not more than 2 percentage points ad valorem (or its ad valorem equivalent in the case of a specific rate, or a combination of ad valorem and specific rates). The reduction in any one year under this alternative may not exceed 1 percentage point. On rates of duty below 10 percent ad valorem or its equivalent, this alternative will permit a larger reduction than the maximum decrease obtainable under (1) above. Thus if the July 1, 1958, rate on an article was 5 percent ad valorem, a reduction by 20 percent would yield a rate of 4 percent ad valorem whereas a reduction by 2 percentage points would yield a rate of 3 percent ad valorem. Consistent with the provisions of existing legislation, this alternative can not be used to transfer an item from the dutiable list to the free list.<sup>1</sup>

3. Reducing to 50 percent ad valorem or its equivalent a rate which is in excess of that level, provided that not more than one-third of the total reduction may become effective in any one year. Similar authority was contained in the 1955 Extension Act. On rates in excess of 62 percent, this alternative would permit a greater reduction than that obtainable under alternatives (1) or (2).

<sup>1</sup> With respect to alternatives (1) and (2), in the exceptional cases where a rate may have been increased between July 1, 1958, and the date of a trade agreement concluded under the authority of the 1958 act, the maximum reduction which may be put into effect in any one year is one-third of the total reduction made under the trade agreement, if such one-third is greater than the 10 percent reduction or the 1 percentage point reduction stipulated as the maximum under alternatives (1) and (2) respectively.



In no case may reductions be made in more than four stages, nor may separate stages be less than a year apart, nor may the last stage be later than 3 years after the first stage. Authority to reduce tariffs is not lost year by year if not put into effect, as was the case under the 1955 act. The full amount of the authority provided by any of the three alternatives in the 1958 act may be used on any article in a trade agreement entered into at any time during the 4-year period ending June 30, 1962. The reduction may be put into effect either during that period or thereafter, except that no part of any decrease is permitted to come into effect for the first time later than June 30, 1966.

#### **Authority To Increase Rates of Duty**

The President's authority to raise rates of duty, which is of principal significance in escape-clause cases, is amended for the purpose of minimizing the need to resort to quotas. The amendments are as follows:

1. The President is authorized to raise duties as much as 50 percent over the rates which existed on July 1, 1934. Previous legislation provided authority to increase by 50 percent rates existing on January 1, 1945. In the case of items on which the rates of duty had been decreased in trade agreements between these two dates, the change in the base date will correspondingly increase the extent to which rates can be raised.

2. Another amendment permits conversion of a specific duty, e. g., a duty expressed in such terms as cents per pound or per gallon, to the ad valorem equivalent which the 1934 rate had in terms of imports in 1934, when prices were generally lower than now and the ad valorem equivalent of a specific rate was correspondingly higher. The authority to increase 1934 rates by 50 percent could be applied to the ad valorem equivalents calculated on the 1934 basis.

Both the authority to increase tariff rates and to recalculate specific rates is permissive, not mandatory.

#### **Escape-Clause Provision**

The escape-clause provision, which was first added to the trade agreements legislation in 1951, is amended in several respects, as outlined below:

1. If the President disapproves the Tariff Com-

mission's recommendations in escape-clause cases in whole or in part, the Congress may override the President by approval within 60 days of a concurrent resolution passed by a two-thirds vote of each House. Such a resolution would be given privileged status in order to expedite congressional consideration, and if the resolution were adopted, prompt implementation of the Commission's recommendations would ensue. The provision does not eliminate Presidential discretion in escape-clause cases since the President's decision would stand unless the Congress approved a resolution to override his decision.

2. The President is authorized in escape-clause cases to impose a duty up to 50 percent ad valorem on a duty-free item which is bound free in a trade agreement. This is a departure from the previous denial of authority to the President to transfer items between the dutiable and free lists. The new authority is permissive, not mandatory. Under previous legislation the only remedy available in the case of escape-clause action on a duty-free item would have been the imposition of an import quota. (See also the immediately preceding section on authority to increase rates on dutiable items.)

3. Escape-clause investigations and reports are to be completed by the Tariff Commission in 6 months instead of the 9 months provided in previous legislation. This change will permit expediting any relief to domestic industry which may be found necessary.

4. The 1958 act specifically provides that organizations or groups of employees are eligible to apply for escape-clause investigations, thus making clear that such bodies may apply even though management is not a party to the application.

#### **Peril-Point Provision**

The so-called peril-point provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 requires the Tariff Commission to investigate and report to the President with respect to each article under consideration for possible modification of tariff treatment in a trade agreement negotiation: (a) the limit to which U.S. duties may be reduced without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or competitive articles, or (b) the minimum increases in U.S. duties or additional import restrictions which may be required to avoid serious injury. If the Presi-

dent enters into a trade agreement in which reductions go below the limits found by the Tariff Commission or which fails to include increases found necessary by the Commission, he must within 30 days report to the Congress his reasons for the action taken. The 1958 act makes the following modifications in the peril-point provision:

1. The period of time provided for the Tariff Commission's peril-point investigations and reports is increased to 6 months from the 120 days provided in previous legislation.

2. With respect to each article covered by a peril-point investigation, the Tariff Commission shall to the extent practicable and without excluding other factors:

- (a) ascertain the average invoice price, on a country-of-origin basis, at which the foreign article was sold for export to the United States, and the average price at which the like or directly competitive domestic articles were sold at wholesale in the principal U.S. markets during the last calendar year preceding the investigation, and

- (b) estimate the maximum increase in annual imports which may occur without causing serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles. The Tariff Commission is directed to ask the executive departments and agencies for information in their possession concerning prices and pertinent economic data in the foreign country which is the principal supplier of each such article.

3. Whenever the Tariff Commission, during the course of a peril-point investigation, finds with respect to an article on which a previous tariff concession has been made that an increase in duty or additional import restriction is required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing a like or competitive article, the Commission is directed to start an escape-clause investigation immediately, thus facilitating early settlement of the issues in such cases.

#### **National Security Provision**

The national security provision, first introduced in the 1954 extension act and substantially amended in the 1955 act, is retained in the 1958 act with significant amendments as follows:

1. The duty on any article is not to be reduced if the President finds that such reduction would

threaten to impair the national security. The corresponding provision in previous legislation barred any such reduction if the President found it would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements.

2. On request of any U. S. Government department or agency, on application by any interested party, or on his own motion, the Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization (ODCM) is immediately to make an appropriate investigation to determine the effects on the national security of imports of the article in question. This section of the bill provides the following with respect to possible action by the President:

... If, as a result of such investigation, the Director is of the opinion that the said article is being imported into the United States in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall promptly so advise the President and, unless the President determines that the article is not being imported into the United States in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security as set forth in this section, he shall take such action, and for such time, as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article and its derivatives so that such imports will not so threaten to impair the national security.

3. As guidance to the Director of ODCM and the President in considering and determining whether imports are threatening to impair the national security, the 1958 act sets forth certain factors in detail but provides that other relevant factors are not to be excluded. The following is the pertinent language of the act:

For the purposes of this section, the Director and the President shall, in the light of the requirements of national security and without excluding other relevant factors, give consideration to domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements, the capacity of domestic industries to meet such requirements, existing and anticipated availabilities of the human resources, products, raw materials, and other supplies and services essential to the national defense, the requirements of growth of such industries and such supplies and services including the investment, exploration, and development necessary to assure such growth, and the importation of goods in terms of their quantities, availabilities, character, and use as those affect such industries and the capacity of the United States to meet national security requirements. In the administration of this section, the Director and the President shall further recognize the close relation of the economic welfare of the Nation to our national security, and shall take into consideration the impact of foreign competition on the economic welfare of



individual domestic industries; and any substantial unemployment, decrease in revenues of government, loss of skills or investment, or other serious effects resulting from the displacement of any domestic products by excessive imports shall be considered, without excluding other factors, in determining whether such weakening of our internal economy may impair the national security.

4. A report is to be issued on the outcome of each case. The Director of ODCM is required to: (a) publish procedural regulations to give effect to his authority to make investigations under the national security provision, and (b) in consultation with other Government agencies and with the approval of the President, to submit to the Congress by February 1, 1959, a report on the administration of the national security amendment.

5. The 1958 act specifies that the changes in the national security provision shall not require the reopening of any actions taken or determinations made under previous legislation.

#### **Other Provisions**

1. Under existing legislation the President is required to submit to the Congress an annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program. The 1958 act directs the President to include in such reports a statement on progress made in obtaining the removal of foreign restrictions against U.S. exports, including restrictions which discriminate against the United States, and the measures available to secure their removal in accordance with the objectives of the act.

2. The 1958 act declares it to be the sense of the Congress that the President, during the course of negotiating a foreign trade agreement under the authority of the act, should secure information and advice with respect thereto from representatives of American industry, agriculture, and labor.

3. The Tariff Commission is expressly provided with the power of subpoena and related authority to obtain information in connection with its responsibilities under the trade agreements and other legislation. This amendment will aid in assuring that the Commission will have access to any pertinent available information in escape-clause and other investigations.

4. The new legislation repeats standard language, which the Congress has embodied in the last several extension acts, providing that enact-

ment of the 1958 act shall not be construed as either approval or disapproval of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

### **World Bank Grants Loan to India for Railway Improvement**

The World Bank announced on September 12 that it has approved a loan equivalent to \$85 million to India to help meet the foreign-exchange costs of a program to improve and expand the Indian railways, an important part of India's Second Five-Year Plan.

The First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company of Philadelphia will participate in the loan, without the World Bank's guaranty, to the extent of \$500,000 representing parts of the first five maturities which fall due between January 15, 1963, and January 15, 1965.

The bank's loan will help pay part of the cost of rolling stock, locomotives, and other equipment required for the expansion program and will meet a large part of the payments already made or to be made for such equipment during 1958 and the first quarter of 1959.

The loan should be completely disbursed by the end of March 1959. By that time, it is expected that \$15 million will have been disbursed from the bank's recent \$25 million loan for electric power development in the Damodar Valley. As a result, the equivalent of some \$100 million, over and above disbursements on earlier bank loans, will be made available to India by the bank during the remainder of India's current fiscal year. This constitutes the bank's part in the arrangements recently discussed by the bank with representatives of the Governments of Canada, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States for covering India's additional foreign-exchange requirements of \$350 million during this period.

The Indian railway system, the fourth largest in the world, is owned by the Government and managed and operated by the Railway Board, a part of the Ministry of Railways. The railways are by far the most important form of transport in India and carry large volumes of long-haul traffic that highways and river and coastal shipping do not handle.

Improvement and expansion of the railways has progressed satisfactorily in the Second Five-Year Plan and the shortage of rail transport is now less acute than it was 2 years ago. Adjustments in the program are continually made to meet the needs of traffic as they develop. Since July 1957, when the bank lent India the equivalent of \$90 million for the railways, the program has been revised to provide for an increase in freight-carrying capacity. During the plan period, it is now intended to increase freight capacity of the railways from 114 million tons annually to 168 million tons, instead of the 162 million originally planned. This will require the purchase of 11,000 additional freight cars over the 107,000 originally intended. Plans to meet a 15 percent increase in passenger traffic during the plan period remain unchanged.

The approved expenditures on the railway program under the Second Five-Year Plan were to be 11,250 million rupees (\$2,363 million equivalent) of which some 4,250 million rupees (\$893 million equivalent) would be required in foreign currencies for the purchase of essential goods, materials, and equipment which are either not produced in India or of which the domestic supply is insufficient.

The additional increase now planned in freight capacity should be attained without adding substantially to the original estimates of total costs and with an actual reduction in the foreign-exchange costs. This will be achieved by improved operating efficiency and the postponement of certain less essential parts of the railway program.

The loan will be for a term of 20 years and will bear interest of 5¾ percent including the 1 percent commission which is allocated to the bank's special reserve. Amortization will begin January 15, 1963. This will bring the total amount of loans which the bank has made to India, net of cancellations, to \$507 million; the net amount held by the bank, after allowing for repayments and amounts sold to third parties, is \$450 million.

The loan was approved today by the bank's executive directors and the loan documents are to be signed on Tuesday, September 16, by Harishwar Dayal, Minister and Chargé d'Affaires of the Embassy of India at Washington, on behalf of the Government of India, and by Eugene R. Black, President, on behalf of the World Bank.

## THE CONGRESS

### President Expresses Views on Mutual Security Program

*Following is an exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the mutual security program.*

#### PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO SENATOR GREEN

SEPTEMBER 11, 1958

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your August 25 letter, co-signed by several of your colleagues, and also the separate comments of Senators Smith and Capehart. Certainly we agree fully as to the already great and steadily growing importance of our economic assistance programs. For a considerable time I have urged their expansion and have been gratified by your Committee's support, but unfortunately the Congress as a whole has sharply reduced the appropriations. Additional emphasis on these programs is being considered, and I judge from your letter that in this effort I can continue to count on your Committee's support.

As for the military part of mutual security, I am acutely conscious of its world-wide implications. Not only have requests for funds for the military programs been reduced appreciably since this Administration took office, but the percentage of the total effort devoted to military and related aid has been also substantially decreased. Enlargement of our economic programs next year would of course further decrease the military proportion.

Because both of these programs—the military as well as the economic—serve our national interests, an increasing of one at the expense of the other could have very harmful effects. Without prejudging the matter, I must say that the threatening posture of the Sino-Soviet Bloc, the importance of our collective security relationships, and the increasing cost of weapons will require a most

careful weighing of the security impact of further reductions in military programs before they can be seriously contemplated.

I have sent copies of your letter to Secretary Dulles and Secretary McElroy. Please give your colleagues my assurance that their views will have thoughtful attention as next year's program is readied for submission to Congress.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.*

#### COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO THE PRESIDENT

AUGUST 25, 1958

THE PRESIDENT,  
*The White House*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On August 23, the Mutual Security Appropriations Bill for 1959 was approved by the Congress. The undersigned members of the Committee on Foreign Relations voted in favor of this bill as they had previously done with respect to the authorizing legislation.

The experience was not a new one for us. Every member who has affixed his signature to this letter has generally supported Mutual Security legislation throughout the years of your Administration as well as of the previous Administration. We have been aware of the great monetary cost to the people of the United States which the policy of mutual security has involved. We have measured that cost, however, against the even greater cost of a spread of totalitarianism and the ultimate cost of another war to the United States. On balance, it has been clear to us that the monetary cost of mutual security has been warranted by the service which that policy has heretofore performed in strengthening the resistance of other nations to totalitarianism and thereby reducing the danger of another great war.

In writing you concerning the Mutual Security Program, we do so with a sense of non-partisanship in matters which concern the vital interests of the nation. This is why we have delayed this letter until after the completion of the legislative process on this program. We write now to inform you of our deep concern over the present

concept and administration of the program. We do not presume to trespass on your authority as President of the United States to administer the law of the United States. We do believe, however, as individual members of the Senate with some experience and understanding of the program and a full appreciation of its importance, that with respect to the less developed countries there is a serious distortion in the present relative importance which is attached to military and related aid on the one hand and technical assistance and self-liquidating economic development assistance on the other. For several years, we have received testimony and otherwise obtained information which tends to support this opinion. Furthermore, we have seen of late many statements in the press by members of your Administration which suggest that the primary threat of Soviet totalitarianism lies in the political and economic realm. Yet the Mutual Security Program which the Administration presented to the Congress reflects little responsiveness to these observations.

Overemphasis on military assistance has tended unavoidably to involve the United States in situations in which our aid may have contributed to the maintenance in power of regimes which have lacked broad support within the countries we have assisted. It has helped to create abroad a militaristic image of the United States which is a distortion of our national character. It has distracted attention, energy and perhaps economic aid, from more pressing problems. And finally, we believe military assistance by its very nature tends to create and then to perpetuate military hierarchies which even in the most well-developed countries may endanger the very values of individual freedom which we seek to safeguard.

In support of these views, we refer to the unanimous report last year of the Special Committee to Study the Foreign Aid Program,<sup>1</sup> in which it was recommended that although "military aid should be continued," "efforts consistent with national security should be made to reduce the rate of expenditures". That same report drew attention to three specific questions which the Committee felt required careful examination, namely:

<sup>1</sup> For the final report of the committee, see S. Rept. 300, 85th Cong., 1st sess.

"(1) The suitability of the level of military aid and the types of arms being provided to less developed countries; (2) the possibility that competition for arms aid among recipients is adding unduly to the cost of the program; (3) the possibility that, in planning foreign aid programs, insufficient consideration is given to the impact of arms aid as a factor in generating increased needs for supporting aid."

While we know you have had considerations of this kind in mind in preparing annual presentations of the Mutual Security Program, we believe that there may have been a tendency to believe that Congress blindly supports military assistance but looks with disfavor on economic assistance. So far as the undersigned are concerned that is not the case. Indeed, during consideration this year of the Mutual Security legislation, various of the undersigned gave serious consideration, or urged, or voted for substantial reductions of the funds available for military assistance. Such reductions either were not proposed or were not adopted because of the possibility of serious foreign policy repercussions unless reductions in military assistance can be carefully planned and phased into being over a period of time.

It seems to us of the greatest national importance that you give personal attention to this matter in the time which will elapse before the Mutual Security legislation is again presented to the Congress. We urge most respectfully that you study the Mutual Security Program in the light of the views of members of your Administration, of members of Congress and many others who have stressed that it is in the political and economic realm that the concepts of freedom are now undergoing a universal trial. It may be that such a study will lead you, Mr. President, as it has led us to the conclusion that the principal and most costly shortcoming in the Mutual Security Program remains as it has been for some time—the failure to emphasize military aid less and to stress economic aid and technical assistance more. It may be that such a study will reveal that the military and non-military portions of the program are drawn up independently to an undue extent and then put together automatically in the same package.

We are anxious to do what is necessary for the welfare of the nation. So long as an aid program serves the enlightened self-interest of the people

of the United States, we shall support it. We can do so, however, only if it is reasonably clear that it is administered in a fashion which does, in fact, contribute to that end. Therefore, we express to you our concern that we may be pursuing a pattern of foreign aid drawn by force of habit rather than one adjusted to current international realities.

We write you at this time because we are aware that budgets for the Mutual Security Program are prepared many months in advance. If there is to be an adjustment in this program in 1959, then the most appropriate time to act is now. We hope that before this program is again presented to Congress you will have had opportunity to re-appraise the relationship between the military and economic assistance aspects of the Mutual Security Program.

Yours respectfully,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN  
J. W. FULBRIGHT  
JOHN J. SPARKMAN  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
MIKE MANSFIELD  
WAYNE MORSE  
JOHN F. KENNEDY  
WILLIAM LANGER

#### Enclosures

#### SENATOR SMITH TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT

AUGUST 21, 1958

DEAR BILL: I apologize for my delay in answering your letter of August 13th.

On reflection, while I feel that your emphasis on economic aid rather than military aid is a sound approach, I would prefer not to join in a letter from the entire Committee which would seem to imply that the operations of the Administration were open to criticism.

My own feeling is that while I would favor less military aid, nevertheless we have been compelled to think of the security of our country in light of the Soviet threat. These security needs must be balanced with our consideration of what might be called the wider range of our activities in supporting a positive program for the betterment of the other countries of the world.

My hope is that we can ultimately work out disarmament movements and UN responsibilities so that by degrees the military side can be substantially reduced. As rapidly as this can be accomplished we can move into the constructive build-up side in order that there may be a broad area of cooperation between the better-to-do nations of the world, and the underdeveloped areas, in



terms of insuring the freedom, independence and self-determination, and especially economic stability of the latter.

This is doubtless along the same lines as your thinking, but just as I am leaving the Senate I do not wish to join in what might be construed to be a criticism of the Administration's policies which I have been defending vigorously since the mutual security concept was inaugurated.

Should you and your colleagues decide to forward the letter you have sent to us, I would be glad to have you enclose this letter with it, indicating that I am in agreement with your thoughts of moving more and more towards the constructive, positive side and ultimately reducing the defensive, negative side.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH, U.S.S.

The Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT  
*United States Senate*  
*Washington, D. C.*

#### SENATOR CAPEHART TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT

AUGUST 22, 1958

DEAR BILL: I am sorry that I have delayed so long in replying to your letter of August 13th with reference to your proposal to forward a letter on the subject of mutual security appropriations to President Eisenhower.

Bill, I would say frankly that I am not in a position to join as a co-signer of the proposed letter which you enclosed. My position on the matter of military and economic aid is well known and I feel that it would be inappropriate for me to join as co-signer of a communication which might be interpreted to contain implications of criticism to the Administration.

I am sure you know, because you have heard me say so many, many times, that I favor the appropriation of military aid funds directly to our own military to be administered by our own military establishment. I likewise have favored converting whatever economic aid program is dictated by the circumstances of the moment into a loan program.

I hope with you that the day will come when the necessity for military aid is reduced or eliminated entirely. I do not see that possibility at the moment in the light of continuing Soviet threats.

While I am sure that you and I are in complete agreement on the objectives of the mutual security program, I do not feel that I can completely endorse the views expressed in the proposed draft of your letter at this time. Thus, if you and other members of the committee

do decide to send your letter to the President, I hope you will feel that it is appropriate to include this letter as an expression of my own views on the subject.

I very much appreciate your giving me the opportunity to express my views with respect to this very, very important matter.

Regards.

Sincerely,

HOMER E. CAPEHART

Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT  
*Room 409*  
*United States Senate*  
*Washington, D. C.*

## Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

### 85th Congress, 2d Session

Operation of Article VII, NATO Status of Forces Treaty.

Report of the Senate Committee on Armed Services made by its Subcommittee on the Operation of Article VII of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement to review operation of article VII of the agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces covering period from December 1, 1956, through November 30, 1957. S. Rept. 2497, August 23, 1958. 15 pp.

Mutual Security Act of 1959. Conference report to accompany H. R. 13192. H. Rept. 2704, August 23, 1958. 4 pp.

## DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

### Designations

James R. Johnstone as Executive Director, Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs, effective September 16.

Turner C. Cameron as Deputy Director, Office of Western European Affairs, effective September 21.

Russell Fessenden as Deputy Director, Office of European Regional Affairs, effective September 21.

Robert H. McBride as Director, Office of Western European Affairs, effective September 21.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

### Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings<sup>1</sup>

#### Adjourned During September 1958

ICAO Special Communications Preparatory Meeting for the ITU Radio Conference.	Montreal . . . . .	Aug. 19-Sept. 9
19th International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art. . . . .	Venice . . . . .	Aug. 24-Sept. 1
19th International Exhibition of Feature Film . . . . .	Venice . . . . .	Aug. 24-Sept. 7
12th International Edinburgh Film Festival . . . . .	Edinburgh . . . . .	Aug. 24-Sept. 14
International Union of Biochemistry: 3d General Assembly . . . .	Vienna . . . . .	Sept. 1-6
ICAO Development/Implementation Panel for the Meteorological Operational Telecommunications Network for Europe.	Paris . . . . .	Sept. 1-10
2d U.N. International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.	Geneva . . . . .	Sept. 1-13
U.N. Committee on South-West Africa . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Sept. 2-5
UNICEF Executive Board and Program Committee . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Sept. 2-11
U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Economic Development and Planning: 4th Meeting.	Bangkok . . . . .	Sept. 2-13
International Statistical Institute: Special Session . . . . .	Brussels . . . . .	Sept. 3-8
6th International Congress of Tropical Medicine and Malaria . . .	Lisbon . . . . .	Sept. 5-13
World Power Conference: International Executive Council . . . .	Montreal . . . . .	Sept. 6 and 10
World Power Conference: 12th Sectional Meeting . . . . .	Montreal . . . . .	Sept. 7-11
U.N. Exploratory Meeting on Copper . . . . .	London . . . . .	Sept. 8-10
18th International Congress of Ophthalmology . . . . .	Brussels . . . . .	Sept. 8-12
FAO Governmental Experts on the Use of Designations, Definitions, and Standards for Milk and Milk Products.	Rome . . . . .	Sept. 8-13
FAO Technical Meeting on the Costs and Earnings of Fishing Enterprises.	London . . . . .	Sept. 8-13
ICAO Legal Committee: Subcommittee on Legal Status of Aircraft.	Montreal . . . . .	Sept. 9-20
U.N. Exploratory Meeting on Lead and Zinc . . . . .	London . . . . .	Sept. 11-13
FAO Experts on National Dairy Policies . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Sept. 15-19
U.N. Trusteeship Council: 8th Special Session.	New York . . . . .	Sept. 15-19
International Commission for Criminal Police: 27th Session of the General Assembly.	London . . . . .	Sept. 15-20
6th International Congress on Large Dams . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Sept. 15-20
IAEA Board of Governors: 8th Session . . . . .	Vienna . . . . .	Sept. 16-20
FAO International Chestnut Commission: 4th Session . . . . .	Yugoslavia . . . . .	Sept. 22-30
11th World Poultry Congress . . . . .	México, D. F. . . . .	Sept. 21-28
Informal Meeting of American Foreign Ministers . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	Sept. 23-24
UNREF Executive Committee: 9th (Special) Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Sept. 25-26*

#### In Session as of September 30, 1958

U.N. General Assembly: 13th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Sept. 16-
15th Pan American Sanitary Conference and 10th Meeting of the Regional Committee of WHO for the Americas.	San Juan . . . . .	Sept. 21-
GATT Intersessional Committee . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Sept. 22-
International Atomic Energy Agency: 2d General Conference . .	Vienna . . . . .	Sept. 22-
U.N. Sugar Conference . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Sept. 22-
WHO Regional Committee for the Western Pacific: 9th Session . .	Manila . . . . .	Sept. 26-
South Pacific Commission: 18th Session . . . . .	Nouméa, New Caledonia . .	Sept. 26-
ICAO Panel of Teletypewriter Specialists: 3d Meeting . . . . .	Montreal . . . . .	Sept. 29-
Commonwealth Specialist Subcommittee of Service Psychologists .	Melbourne . . . . .	Sept. 29-
WMO Commission on Agricultural Meteorology: 2d Session . . .	Warsaw . . . . .	Sept. 29-
FAO/UNICEF Joint Policy Committee . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Sept. 29-

<sup>1</sup> Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, Sept. 18, 1958. Asterisks indicate tentative dates and places. Following is a list of abbreviations: ANZUS, Australia, New Zealand, United States Treaty; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; ECOSOC, Economic and Social Council; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; ICEM, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; ILO, International Labor Organization; PASO, Pan American Sanitary Organization; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; UNICEF, United Nations Children's Fund; UNREF, United Nations Refugee Fund; WHO, World Health Organization; WMO, World Meteorological Organization.



# Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings—Continued

## Scheduled October 1–December 31, 1958

International Symposium on U.S. Domestic Short Distance Navigation System (VORTAC) and Its Relationship to the International Air Navigation System.	Washington . . . . .	Oct. 1–
ANZUS: 6th Meeting.	Indianapolis . . . . .	Oct. 3–
International Council of Scientific Unions: 8th General Assembly .	Washington . . . . .	Oct. 1–
FAO International Rice Commission: 6th Session . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	Oct. 2–
International Union of Official Travel Organizations: 13th General Assembly.	Tokyo . . . . .	Oct. 3–
Diplomatic Conference for Revision of Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.	Brussels . . . . .	Oct. 3–
4th FAO Regional Conference for Asia and the Far East . . . . .	Lisbon . . . . .	Oct. 6–
International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and International Finance Corporation: Annual Meetings of Boards of Governors.	Tokyo . . . . .	Oct. 6–
PASO Executive Committee: 36th Meeting . . . . .	New Delhi . . . . .	Oct. 6–
U.N. ECE Working Party on Electric Power Statistics . . . . .	San Juan . . . . .	Oct. 6–
Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Defense Sciences . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Oct. 6–
U.N. ECE Working Party on Rural Electrification . . . . .	Canberra . . . . .	Oct. 7–
FAO General Fisheries Council of the Mediterranean: 5th Meeting.	Geneva . . . . .	Oct. 7–
Structural Division of American Society of Civil Engineers and International Association for Bridge and Structural Engineering: Joint Meeting.	Rome . . . . .	Oct. 13–
U.N. ECE Timber Committee: 16th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Oct. 13–
GATT Contracting Parties: 13th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Oct. 13–
9th U.N. ECOSOC Technical Assistance Conference . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Oct. 16–
FAO Near East Forestry Commission: 2d Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Oct. 16–
Consultative Committee for Cooperative Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia ("Colombo Plan"): 10th Meeting.	Iraq . . . . .	Oct. 18–
Preliminary Working Group . . . . .	Seattle . . . . .	Oct. 20–
Officials Meeting . . . . .	Seattle . . . . .	Oct. 27–
Ministerial Meeting . . . . .	Seattle . . . . .	Nov. 10–
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: 6th Meeting . .	Tokyo . . . . .	Oct. 20–
U.N. ECAFE Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East.	Tokyo . . . . .	Oct. 20–
FAO Group on Coconut: 2d Session . . . . .	Manila . . . . .	Oct. 21–
ICAO Rules of the Air and Air Traffic Control/Search and Rescue Divisional Meeting.	Montreal . . . . .	Oct. 21–
U.N. ECAFE Industry and Natural Resources Committee: 8th Session of Subcommittee on Iron and Steel.	Bangkok . . . . .	Oct. 21–
FAO Council: 29th Session . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Oct. 27–
U.N. ECE Committee on Development of Trade and East-West Trade Consultations.	Geneva . . . . .	Oct. 27–
UNESCO Executive Board: 52d Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	Oct. 27–
U.N. Preliminary Wheat Conference . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Oct. 29–
UNESCO Directors of National Cultural Relations: 2d Meeting .	Paris . . . . .	Oct. 28–
South Pacific Commission: Special Conference on Tuberculosis .	Pago Pago . . . . .	Oct. 31–
International Sugar Council: 16th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	October
International Sugar Council: Executive Committee . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	October
International Sugar Council: Statistical Committee . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	October
International Wheat Council: 25th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	October
2d Pan American Congress of the Theater . . . . .	Habana . . . . .	October
6th Inter-American Congress of Radiology . . . . .	Lima . . . . .	Nov. 2–
ILO Governing Body: 140th Session (and Committees)	Geneva . . . . .	Nov. 3–
FAO Latin American Forestry Commission: 6th Session . . . . .	Guatemala City . . . . .	Nov. 4–
ICEM Executive Committee: 11th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Nov. 4–
U.N. ECAFE Inland Transport Committee: 4th Session of Highway Subcommittee.	Bangkok . . . . .	Nov. 4–
UNESCO General Conference: 10th Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	Nov. 4–
U.N. ECE Housing Committee: 17th Session and Working Parties .	Geneva . . . . .	Nov. 6–
Technical Discussions on Prevention of Surprise Attack . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Nov. 10–*
U.N. Wheat Conference: Preparatory Committee . . . . .	London . . . . .	Nov. 10–
ICEM Council: 9th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Nov. 12–
U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Customs Administration . . . . .	Bangkok . . . . .	Nov. 12–
FAO Latin American Regional Conference . . . . .	San José . . . . .	Nov. 17–
FAO/WHO Near East Regional Nutrition Meeting . . . . .	Cairo . . . . .	Nov. 18–
ICAO Statistics Division: 3d Session . . . . .	Montreal . . . . .	Nov. 18–
Caribbean Commission: Conference on Revision of Agreement for Establishment of the Commission.	Trinidad . . . . .	Nov. 24–
Customs Cooperation Council: 13th Session . . . . .	Brussels . . . . .	Nov. 24–
ILO Asian Advisory Committee: 9th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Nov. 24–
U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Railway Mechanical Engineers . .	undetermined . . . . .	Nov. 24–

## Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings—Continued

### Scheduled October 1–December 31, 1958—Continued

U.N. ECE Committee on Agricultural Problems: 10th Session . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Nov. 24–
International Fisheries Convention 1946, Permanent Commission: 7th Meeting.	Dublin . . . . .	Nov. 25–
U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Coordination of Transport . . .	Bangkok . . . . .	Nov. 25–
U.N. ECOSOC Technical Assistance Committee . . . . .	New York . . . . .	November
FAO Cocoa Study Group: Committee on Statistics. . . . .	Rome . . . . .	November
FAO Cocoa Study Group: Executive Committee. . . . .	Rome . . . . .	November
Inter-American Technical Meeting on Housing and Planning. . .	Lima . . . . .	November
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: Committee on Biology and Research.	Tokyo . . . . .	November
ICAO Map Panel: 2d Meeting . . . . .	Montreal . . . . .	Dec. 1–
FAO/WHO Technical Meeting on Food Additives . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Dec. 1–
WMO Regional Association for North and Central America: 2d Session.	Washington . . . . .	Dec. 1–
U.N. ECAFE Symposium on Petroleum Resources Development.	New Delhi . . . . .	Dec. 3–
FAO Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council: 8th Meeting.	Colombo . . . . .	Dec. 6–
North Pacific Fur Seal Commission: 2d Meeting . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	Dec. 8–
ILO Technical Tripartite Committee on Timber Industry . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Dec. 8–
U.N. ECAFE Conference of Asian Statisticians: 2d Session . . .	Bangkok . . . . .	Dec. 8–
U.N. ECE Steel Committee and Working Parties . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Dec. 8–
7th Inter-American Travel Congress . . . . .	Montevideo . . . . .	Dec. 9–
FAO Regional Conference for Near East . . . . .	Damascus* . . . . .	Dec. 10–
Caribbean Commission: 27th Meeting . . . . .	Cayenne . . . . .	Dec. 15–
U.N. ECE Coal Trade Subcommittee (and related meetings)	Geneva . . . . .	Dec. 15–
U.N. ECE Inland Transport Committee: 18th Session . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Dec. 15–
U.N. Economic Commission for Africa: 1st Session . . . . .	Addis Ababa . . . . .	Dec. 29–

## Secretary Dulles Congratulates U.S. Delegation to UNESCO

*Following are remarks made by Secretary Dulles on September 12 at swearing-in ceremonies of the U.S. delegation to the 10th session of the General Conference of UNESCO.*

I am delighted to be here at the swearing-in of the United States delegation to the UNESCO General Conference.<sup>1</sup> It is a distinguished delegation, and it properly reflects the leadership which the United States must provide to the world in the intellectual field. It also reflects the importance which the United States and its citizens attach to the work of UNESCO in the fields of education, science, and the arts.

I am particularly well acquainted with the chairman and vice chairman of your delegation. I have for a number of years admired Max Rabb's work as secretary to the Cabinet, and I know that he is well qualified to lead a delegation such as this. I am delighted at this evidence that his recent return to private life has not meant that the

Government will totally lose his services. Johnnie Hanes I have known perhaps even better, because he was my special and trusted assistant for 4 years.

I am glad, too, that this ceremony could take place so fittingly in the presence of the UNESCO National Commission.<sup>2</sup> It is the function of the National Commission to advise the Government in the development of U.S. policies toward UNESCO. The U.S. delegation to the General Conference is the means whereby such policies are carried out. I am doubly pleased, therefore, first, that the delegation includes so many members of the National Commission, including your chairman, Dr. [John R.] Richards; and, second, that it has been possible to arrange this joint meeting today between the entire National Commission and the delegation.

Today's meeting marks two important innovations. Never before has a UNESCO delegation met together so long prior to the conference or had the resulting opportunity to become a full partner in the policy-making process of developing U.S. positions. Also, no previous delegation has met with and received firsthand the advice of

<sup>1</sup> For an announcement of the U.S. delegation, see BULLETIN of Sept. 8, 1958, p. 401.

<sup>2</sup> The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO met at Washington, D.C., Sept. 11–12.

the National Commission. I hope both of these precedents will be continued in the future.

We in the Department of State appreciate deeply the effective work of the National Commission. We know of the long study which you have given to the UNESCO program that will be considered at the November conference. We are certain that the work of our delegation will benefit immensely from your recommendations and your mutual discussions today.

The things which UNESCO symbolizes have always been important, but today their importance is growing—to the United States as well as to the world.

When UNESCO was founded, all of us hoped its work could be carried out in a world of lessened international tensions and of growing good will among nations. Instead, the hostility that exists in the world today, the tensions that continue to find expression, make it far more difficult to carry out successful programs of cultural relations among nations. But the very existence of these tensions and hostilities makes it more necessary than ever to strengthen and use every means to exchange ideas. It is clear that cultural contacts alone will not be likely to bring peace to the world, but it is equally true that political and economic arrangements alone are not likely to bring a peace which can secure the lasting support of the peoples of the world. True peace with justice must rest upon a greater measure of intellectual and moral understanding among all peoples. Your work in the National Commission and the work of our delegation are powerful forces increasing that understanding.

I want to thank the members of this delegation for the service they are performing. The United States is tremendously fortunate in having citizens willing to give their time and energy to represent the United States in international meetings. Very few people realize the long preparation required for these conferences, or the time delegation members must be away from their own business, or the pressure under which they work during the sessions. We—and I—do appreciate that, and your Government appreciates greatly this contribution that you are making to our representation in UNESCO and therefore to our foreign policy and the welfare of the whole United States.

## U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

### Pan American Sanitary Conference and WHO Regional Committee for the Americas

The Department of State announced on September 17 (press release 542) that, the 15th Pan American Sanitary Conference and the 10th meeting of the World Health Organization Regional Committee for the Americas will convene at San Juan, P. R., September 21. The U.S. delegation to this conference is as follows:

#### *Delegates*

Leroy E. Burney, M. D., *chairman*, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Guillermo Arbona, M. D., Secretary of Health, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

H. van Zile Hyde, M. D., Special Assistant to the Surgeon General for International Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

#### *Advisers*

Roberto Francisco Azize, M. D., Director, Department of Cardiology, San Juan Diagnostic Clinic, San Juan, P. R.

John B. Grant, M. D., Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Puerto Rico

Luis Guzman, M. D., President, Medical Association, San Juan, P. R.

Harold Hinman, M. D., Dean, School of Medicine, University of Puerto Rico

Matthew R. Kinde, M. D., Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.

Eric L. O'Neal, M. D., Commissioner of Health, Virgin Islands

Charles G. Sommer, Office of International Administration, Department of State

Charles L. Williams, Jr., M. D., Deputy Chief, Public Health Division, International Cooperation Administration

Simon N. Wilson, Office of Inter-American Regional Political Affairs, Department of State

#### *Secretary of Delegation*

J. Harlan Southerland, Office of International Conferences, Department of State

#### *Members of the Staff*

Louise Beane, Office of the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Betty L. Groves, Library Division, Department of State

Barbara Younghans, Employment Division, Department of State

The Pan American Sanitary Conference is the governing body of the Pan American Sanitary

Organization (PASO), the international coordinating authority for public health in the Americas, and serves as the Regional Committee for the Americas of the World Health Organization. Between quadrennial conferences the Directing Council serves in the same capacity. The 14th Conference was held at Santiago, Chile, October 8-22, 1954.

The 15th Conference will plan the activities of the Pan American Sanitary Organization for the next 4 years. It will consider the proposed programs and budgets of WHO for the Americas and PASO for 1960 and adopt the program and budget for PASO for 1959, based upon the proposals submitted by the director and the Executive Committee.

It will also elect the director of PASB (Pan American Sanitary Bureau) for the next 4 years, elect three members to the Executive Board, and consider certain technical amendments to the constitution. Dr. Fred C. Soper has been director of the Bureau since 1947.

The principal technical programs to be discussed are status of malaria eradication in the Americas, eradication of smallpox, work of the Institution of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP), and the status of *Aedes aegypti* (yellow-fever eradication campaign). Other highlights of the conference will be consideration of reports of member states on public health conditions and achievements during the last 4 years, and technical discussions on the prevention of accidents in childhood.

## TREATY INFORMATION

### Current Actions

#### MULTILATERAL

##### Atomic Energy

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Done at New York October 26, 1956. Entered into force July 29, 1957. TIAS 3873.

*Ratification deposited:* Iran, September 16, 1958.

##### Finance

Articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund. Opened for signature at Washington December 27, 1945. Entered into force December 27, 1945. TIAS 1501.

*Signatures and acceptances:* Spain, September 15, 1958; Libya, September 17, 1958.

Articles of agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Opened for signature at Washington December 27, 1945. Entered into force December 27, 1945. TIAS 1502.

*Signatures and acceptances:* Spain, September 15, 1958; Libya, September 17, 1958.

Protocol terminating obligations arising from the accord of May 10, 1948 (TIAS 1773), regarding German assets in Spain, and exchange of notes. Signed at Madrid August 9, 1958. Enters into force on date of entry into force of agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and Spain on certain consequences of the Second World War, signed April 8, 1958.

*Signatures:* France, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States.

Articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation. Done at Washington May 25, 1955. Entered into force July 20, 1956. TIAS 3620.

*Signature and acceptance:* Ireland, September 11, 1958.

#### International Court of Justice

Statute of the International Court of Justice (59 Stat. 1055).

*Declaration recognizing compulsory jurisdiction renewed:* Turkey, August 7, 1958. Effective for a further 5-year period from May 23, 1957.

#### Law of the Sea

Convention on the territorial sea and the contiguous zone. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958. Enters into force on the 30th day following the deposit of the 22d ratification or accession.<sup>1</sup>

*Signatures:* Argentina, Canada, China, Colombia (with reservation), Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Nepal, Thailand, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, April 29, 1958; Holy See, April 30, 1958; Panama, May 2, 1958; Liberia, May 27, 1958; Iran (with reservation), May 28, 1958; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, September 9, 1958; United States, September 15, 1958.

Convention on the high seas. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958. Enters into force on the 30th day following the deposit of the 22d ratification or accession.<sup>1</sup>

*Signatures:* Argentina, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Nepal, Thailand, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, April 29, 1958; Holy See, April 30, 1958; Panama, May 2, 1958; Indonesia, May 8, 1958; Switzerland, May 24, 1958; Liberia, May 27, 1958; Iran (with reservations), May 28, 1958; Lebanon, May 29, 1958; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, September 9, 1958; United States, September 15, 1958.

Convention on fishing and conservation of living resources of the high seas. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958. Enters into force on the 30th day following the deposit of the 22d ratification or accession.<sup>1</sup>

*Signatures:* Argentina, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Nepal, Thailand, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, April 29, 1958; Panama, May 2, 1958; Indonesia, May 8, 1958; Liberia, May 27, 1958; Iran, May 28, 1958; Lebanon, May 29, 1958; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, September 9, 1958; United States, September 15, 1958.

Convention on the continental shelf. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958. Enters into force the 30th day following the deposit of the 22d ratification or accession.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Not in force.



*Signatures:* Argentina, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Nepal, Thailand, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, April 29, 1958; Panama, May 2, 1958; Liberia, May 27, 1958; Iran (with reservations), May 28, 1958; Lebanon, May 29, 1958; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, September 9, 1958; United States, September 15, 1958.

Optional protocol of signature concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958. Enters into force upon signature unless ratification is required by the constitution of the signatory state.<sup>1</sup>

*Signatures:* Canada, China, Colombia (with reservation), Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Haiti, Israel (ad referendum), Nepal, Uruguay, Yugoslavia (subject to ratification), April 29, 1958; Holy See, April 30, 1958; Panama, May 2, 1958; Indonesia, May 8, 1958; Switzerland (subject to ratification), May 24, 1958; Liberia, May 27, 1958; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, September 9, 1958; United States, September 15, 1958.

### Salvage

Convention for the unification of certain rules with respect to assistance and salvage at sea. Signed at Brussels September 23, 1910. Entered into force March 1, 1913. 37 Stat. 1658.

*Adherence deposited:* Dominican Republic, July 23, 1958.

### Trade and Commerce

Protocol amending part I and articles XXIX and XXX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.<sup>1</sup>

*Declaration deposited recognizing signature as fully binding:* Netherlands, August 26, 1958.

Protocol of organizational amendments to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.<sup>1</sup>

*Declaration deposited recognizing signature as fully binding:* Netherlands, August 26, 1958.

### War

Geneva convention relative to treatment of prisoners of war;

Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded and sick in armed forces in the field;

Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea;

Geneva convention relative to protection of civilian persons in time of war.

Dated at Geneva August 12, 1949. Entered into force October 21, 1950; for the United States February 2, 1956. TIAS 3364, 3362, 3363, and 3365, respectively.

*Accession deposited:* Ghana, August 2, 1958.

## BILATERAL

### Canada

Agreement providing for the establishment of a Canada-United States Committee on Joint Defense. Effected by exchange of notes at Ottawa August 29 and September 2, 1958. Entered into force September 2, 1958.

### Haiti

Agreement providing for duty-free entry into Haiti and exemption from internal taxation of relief supplies and packages. Effected by exchange of notes at Port-au-

<sup>1</sup> Not in force.

<sup>2</sup> Not in force for the United States.

Prince September 8 and 9, 1958. Entered into force September 9, 1958.

### Israel

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreements of April 29, 1955, as supplemented (TIAS 3228 and 3261), November 10, 1955, as amended (TIAS 3429, 3489, and 3497), September 11, 1956 (TIAS 3635), and November 7, 1957, as supplemented (TIAS 3945 and 4063). Effected by exchange of notes at Washington August 28, 1958. Entered into force September 9, 1958.

### Nicaragua

Agreement for the establishment of a Loran Transmitting Station. Signed at Managua September 5, 1958. Entered into force September 5, 1958.

### Yugoslavia

Agreement providing special economic assistance to Yugoslavia. Effected by exchange of notes at Belgrade April 4 and 5, 1958. Entered into force April 5, 1958.

## PUBLICATIONS

### Recent Releases

*For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.*

**Passport Visa Fees.** TIAS 4053. 10 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and New Zealand. Exchange of notes—Dated at Wellington December 16, 1957, and May 2 and 5, 1958. Entered into force on May 5, 1958. And amending agreement. Exchange of notes—Dated at Wellington May 13, 1958. Entered into force May 13, 1958.

**Mutual Defense Assistance—Equipment, Materials, and Services.** TIAS 4055. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Lebanon, amending agreement of June 3 and 6, 1957. Exchange of notes—Signed at Beirut June 9 and 12, 1958. Entered into force June 12, 1958; operative retroactively June 6, 1957.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4056. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Turkey, supplementing agreement of January 20, 1958—Signed at Ankara June 25, 1958. Entered into force June 25, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4057. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Spain, supplementing agreement of January 27, 1958, as supplemented—Signed at Madrid June 30, 1958. Entered into force June 30, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4058. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and

India—Signed at New Delhi June 23, 1958, with related letter. Entered into force June 23, 1958.

**Atomic Energy—Cooperation for Civil Uses.** TIAS 4059. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Ireland—Signed at Washington March 16, 1956. Entered into force July 9, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4060. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement, with exchange of letters, between the United States of America and Yugoslavia—Signed at Belgrade June 26, 1958. Entered into force June 26, 1958.

**Mutual Defense Assistance—Equipment, Materials, and Services.** TIAS 4061. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Bolivia. Exchange of notes—Signed at La Paz March 21 and April 22, 1958. Entered into force April 22, 1958.

**Air Service—Lease of Equipment, Return of Certain Items.** TIAS 4062. 9 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, extending agreement of August 2, 1955. Exchange of notes—Dated at Bonn/Bad Godesberg and Bonn February 24 and May 24, 1958. Entered into force May 24, 1958; operative retroactively August 2, 1957.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4063. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Israel, supplementing agreement of November 7, 1957, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 30, 1958. Entered into force June 30, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4065. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Iceland, supplementing agreement of May 3, 1958. Exchange of notes—Signed at Reykjavik June 25 and 26, 1958. Entered into force June 26, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4066. 10 pp. 10¢.

Agreement, with memorandum of understanding and exchange of notes, between the United States of America and Viet-Nam—Signed at Saigon June 17, 1958. Entered into force June 17, 1958.

**Use of Veterans Memorial Hospital—Grants-in-Aid for Medical Care and Treatment of Veterans.** TIAS 4067. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines—Signed at Manila June 30, 1958. Entered into force July 1, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4068. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Ceylon, amending agreement of June 18, 1958. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 30, 1958. Entered into force June 30, 1958.

**Cultural Relations.** TIAS 4069. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Afghanistan. Exchange of notes—Dated at Washington June 26, 1958. Entered into force June 26, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4070. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Mexico, amending agreement of October 23, 1957. Exchange of notes—Dated at México June 30, 1958. Entered into force June 30, 1958.

**Air Transport Services.** TIAS 4071. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Denmark, amending agreement of December 16, 1944, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington July 8, 1958. Entered into force July 8, 1958.

**Air Transport Services.** TIAS 4072. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Norway, amending agreement of October 6, 1945, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington July 8, 1958. Entered into force July 8, 1958.

**Air Transport Services.** TIAS 4073. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Sweden, amending agreement of December 16, 1944, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington July 8, 1958. Entered into force July 8, 1958.

**Surplus Agricultural Commodities.** TIAS 4074. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Brazil, amending agreement of December 31, 1956, as corrected. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington June 30, 1958. Entered into force June 30, 1958.

**Passport Visas.** TIAS 4076. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, amending agreement of March 28 and April 3, 1956. Exchange of notes—Signed at Pretoria March 31, 1958. Entered into force April 1, 1958.

### Check List of Department of State Press Releases: September 15-21

Press releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Releases issued prior to September 15 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 521 and 526 of September 9, 528 of September 11, 533 and 534 of September 12, and 535 of September 13.

No.	Date	Subject
537	9/15	Note to Czechoslovakia on summit meeting.
†538	9/15	Agreement with U.S.S.R. on exchange of national exhibitions in 1959.
539	9/16	Symposium on air navigation.
*540	9/16	Educational exchange (Egypt, Haiti, Switzerland).
*541	9/17	U.S. company to make surgical dressings in India.
542	9/17	Delegation to 15th PASO conference and 10th meeting of WHO Regional Committee for the Americas (rewrite).
543	9/18	Dulles: U.N. General Assembly.
544	9/18	Dillon trip to 11 countries (rewrite).
†545	9/19	Informal meeting of Foreign Ministers of American Republics (rewrite).

\*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

<b>American Republics.</b> Pan American Sanitary Conference and WHO Regional Committee for the Americas (delegation) . . . . .	553	<b>Secretary Dulles Congratulates U.S. Delegation to UNESCO</b> . . . . .	552
<b>Aviation.</b> International Aviation Authorities To Hold Symposium in U.S. . . . .	535	<b>Japan.</b> Japanese and U.S. Officials Conclude Talks (text of joint statement) . . . . .	532
<b>China</b>		<b>Middle East.</b> Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525
Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525	<b>Military Affairs.</b> United States Seeks Information on Missing Airmen (text of U.S. note) . . . . .	531
U.S. Rejects Soviet Note on Far East Situation . . . . .	530	<b>Mutual Security</b>	
<b>Congress, The</b>		Mr. Dillon To Visit 11 Countries . . . . .	532
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy . . . . .	549	Indian Finance Minister Visits United States . . . . .	535
President Expresses Views on Mutual Security Program (Eisenhower, Green) . . . . .	546	President Expresses Views on Mutual Security Program (Eisenhower, Green) . . . . .	546
<b>Czechoslovakia.</b> U.S. and Czechoslovakia Exchange Views on Summit Conference (texts of U.S. note and Czechoslovak memorandum) . . . . .	539	Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525
<b>Department and Foreign Service.</b> Designations (Cameron, Fessenden, Johnstone, McBride) . . . . .	549	United States and Turkey Hold Economic Discussions (text of joint statement) . . . . .	533
<b>Disarmament.</b> Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525	<b>Presidential Documents</b>	
<b>Economic Affairs</b>		President Expresses Views on Mutual Security Program . . . . .	546
Mr. Dillon To Visit 11 Countries . . . . .	532	U.S. Rejects Soviet Note on Far East Situation . . . . .	530
Indian Finance Minister Visits United States . . . . .	535	<b>Publications.</b> Recent Releases . . . . .	555
Principal Provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 (Kallis) . . . . .	542	<b>Science.</b> Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525
United States and Turkey Hold Economic Discussions . . . . .	533	<b>Treaty Information.</b> Current Actions . . . . .	554
World Bank Loan to India for Railway Improvement . . . . .	545	<b>Turkey.</b> United States and Turkey Hold Economic Discussions (text of joint statement) . . . . .	533
<b>Germany.</b> Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525	<b>U.S.S.R.</b>	
<b>Hungary.</b> Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525	U.S. Rejects Soviet Note on Far East Situation . . . . .	530
<b>India</b>		United States Seeks Information on Missing Airmen (text of U.S. note) . . . . .	531
Indian Finance Minister Visits United States . . . . .	535	<b>United Nations.</b> Problems of Peace and Progress (Dulles) . . . . .	525
World Bank Loan to India for Railway Improvement . . . . .	545		
<b>International Law.</b> International Order Under Law (Rogers) . . . . .	536		
<b>International Organizations and Conferences</b>			
Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings . . . . .	550		
Pan American Sanitary Conference and WHO Regional Committee for the Americas (delegation) . . . . .	553		

## Name Index

Cameron, Turner C. . . . .	549
Desai, Morarji R. . . . .	535
Dillon, Douglas . . . . .	532
Dulles, Secretary . . . . .	525, 552
Eisenhower, President . . . . .	530, 544, 546
Fessenden, Russell . . . . .	549
Green, Theodore Francis . . . . .	547
Johnstone, James R. . . . .	549
Kallis, Selma G. . . . .	542
McBride, Robert H. . . . .	549
Polatkan, Hasan . . . . .	533
Rogers, William P. . . . .	536

DSB-DEC  
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS  
ATT STEVENS RICE  
313 N FIRST ST  
ANN ARBOR MICHIGAN

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS  
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID  
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300  
(GPO)



the  
Department  
of  
State

# DISARMAMENT

*The Intensified Effort, 1955-1958*

This 65-page pamphlet discusses U.S. efforts over the last 3 years to negotiate a sound disarmament agreement.

The narrative begins with a brief summary of U.S. disarmament efforts during the decade of deadlock from 1945-55. This is followed by an account of evolving U.S. disarmament policy during the past 3 years and of negotiations carried on within the U.N. Disarmament Commission and its Subcommittee.

The pamphlet covers in detail the gradual development of U.S. policy from the President's "open skies" proposal at Geneva to the new approach presented at the 1957 London Disarmament Subcommittee meetings and the U.N. General Assembly. It discusses the long and intensive negotiations in London in 1957 and various proposals for a first stage agreement. It ends with a brief overall appraisal of accomplishments and prospects for the future.

Publication 6676

30 cents

## Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents  
Govt. Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ .....  
(cash, check, or  
money order).

*For your convenience, the Order Form is printed below:*

ADDRESS ORDER FORM TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS,  
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON 25, D.C.  
REMITTANCES, PAYABLE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS,  
SHOULD ACCOMPANY ORDERS.

Please send me ..... copies of *Disarmament—The Intensified Effort, 1955-1958*

Name: .....

Street Address: .....

City, Zone, and State: .....